The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME X | New York, Saturday, March 3, 1917 | Number 122

Contents

Editorial Notes 117

Leading Editorials
- "Armed Neutrality" 120
- To Defeat the Submarine 121
- The Next Four Years 123
- Organizing the Next House 124

General Articles
- The Governors in 1917 ..... W. A. Robinson 127
- Mr. Lloyd George's War Conference ..... C. E. Fryer 129
- Portrait of a Congressman ..... Charles Merz 131
- William M. Chase ..... Leo Stein 133

At the Capitol ..... C. M. 134

A Letter to the Kaiser ..... Hettie B. Goldrick 136

After the Play ..... Q. K. 137

Reviews of Books
- Green Sickness ..... F. H. 138
- The Toy Theatre ..... R. E. R. 139
- Citing Spencer for a Purpose ..... H. J. L. 142

THE sinking of the Laconia constitutes clearly an overt act demanding immediate action by the American government. It was an act of brutal terrorism, in deliberate violation of all accepted principles of international law. Formally, it was a challenge to the American nation. It set at naught principles that our government had solemnly proclaimed its intention of defending. The German government, in thus executing its policy of ruthlessness, is quite alive to the fact that it has furnished a ground, technically adequate, for a declaration of war. It has chosen to run the risk of war with America, believing that the gains from unrestricted submarine warfare are worth the cost. In the circumstances, it is difficult to see how peace between the two nations can much longer be maintained. Nevertheless, the Laconia sinking is not an act that will unite the country in support of a declaration of war. It does not loom sufficiently large among the atrocities of the war. On every hand it will be urged that the fact that American lives were lost was more or less an accident. Accordingly we can only say that we are nearer than before to the irreconcilable conflict of national wills that presages war. We have already reached the point where the severance of all relations subsisting between the nations is imperatively demanded. An embargo upon trade with Germany and the prohibition of all intercourse with her subjects is the least that should be done for the present. Such action would at once put an end to all question of enforcing against the Allies our right to trade with Germany. It would place a quietus upon the efforts of the pro-Germans to force a reopening of the question of the British blockade as an offset to the policy of arming our merchant ships.

BETHMANN-HOLLWEG'S indictment of American policy during the war would be valid if we accepted his assumptions. The principal of these is that Germany was attacked. Now, if Germany was really victim of a gigantic conspiracy against her national existence, we have plainly violated the principles of morality, if not of law, in munitioning her enemies. If Germany found herself fighting for life against a superior foe, we should be compelled to excuse her for technical violations of law and even outrages against humanity. If the object for which Germany is now fighting were such as to recommend itself to neutral opinion, as promoting the future peace and happiness of the world, we might be expected to overlook acts technically violating our rights under international law. But Germany stands before the bar of neutral opinion as the chief, if not the only aggressor in this ghastly business of war. At the outset, when her violation of the rules of international law and the principles of humanity were most hideous, she conceived her military power as invincible. The question as it appeared to her was not whether she should continue to exist; it was one of the prompt throttling of her victims. Now we are asked to give up our rights on the sea. To what end? That Germany may dictate a peace exact-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing "reparation for all wrongs suffered and guarantee the existence and future of a strong Germany"—all terms to be defined according to German desire.

THERE is one extraordinary passage in Mr. Wilson's last speech to Congress, to which insufficient justice has been done in the newspaper comment. "Our own commerce," he says, "has suffered, is suffering rather in apprehension than in fact, rather because so many of our ships are timidly keeping to their home ports than because American ships have been sunk." Surely this attempt of the President's to attribute the success of German terrorism to the timidity of American ship-owners is unworthy of its author. He admits the German submarines are operating under instructions which imperil the safety of all American property and life at sea; he goes to Congress with a request for authority to afford adequate protection to the owners of American ships and their crews and passengers; and then he accuses these owners of timidity, because they refuse to adventure the boats without the needed protection. The retort is only too obvious. If German terrorism is triumphant as a consequence of American timidity, it is not American ship-owners who can properly be charged with the fault. The officials of the American line were responsible to their stockholders for the safety of the boats; they were responsible to their own consciences for the security of their employees and passengers; they were not responsible for the conditions which imperiled the safety of the boats and the cargo of American life; they could not redeem their own responsibility without the support and assistance of the American government. That assistance was denied to them and they are accused of timidity by the man who ordered the denial. In the sentence we have quoted Mr. Wilson would have done well to omit the adverb "timidly."

FOR much of the deep misunderstanding in Germany of the American state of mind and policy, we can thank our own short-sightedness and extreme negligence in hampering the transmission of news to that country. Wireless messages to Germany have been subject to a censorship that has been almost unbelievable in its stupidity. After the Sussex sinking, for instance, Wolff Bureau dispatches from New York revealing the extreme gravity of the situation here and forecasting accurately the resolute stand which the President later adopted were held up for no apparent reason till the German press had worked itself into a belief that no definite action would follow. The awakening was most bitter and the cause of unnecessary hostility to this country. So in the arrival of the Deutschland dispatches, which were calculated by the generous recognition of the gallantry of this adventure to allay some of the ill feeling against this country, were not allowed to pass on the pretext that they gave military information. All this time, however, Reuter dispatches to England, subject to no censorship whatsoever, passed freely over the cables and eventually found their way to Germany. More serious still has been the censorship in the present crisis, which, if it could be made public, might explain why Germany has recently taken so many serious steps on insufficient or false information. The situation is doubly serious, both for its effect here and abroad. As it is now, Germany receives from trusted sources in this country only the remnants of what has been allowed to pass young naval lieutenants at Sayville with little knowledge of either diplomacy or newspapers but with deep regard for bureaucratic red tape. Through Reuter trebly sifted news finally percolates into Germany, news selected by the Reuter correspondent in New York as of interest to the British, censored again in London for publication in England, and a third time before being transmitted to Holland or Denmark and thence to Germany. For the United States, the situation is foreboding as indicative of the utter lack of knowledge or realization by officials of the workings and power of the press. This country faces an iron-bound censorship the moment war comes; let it only be hoped that the State Department officials now working on such plans will show more judgment than heretofore and entrust at least a part of the work to trained newspaper men with a practical knowledge of what can and cannot be accomplished by publicists.

THE outstanding fact in relation to the administration espionage measures is their belatedness. After so many months in which we have been hanging over the brink of war, we are seeking to curb espionage and violations of neutrality through laws which by their very terms confess that we had remained passive to the dangers of becoming involved in the war. We shall now be able to prevent, in some measure, the dissemination of reports illuminating to the enemy and disastrous to our own designs. We shall be able to prevent the wilful disabling of foreign shipping sheltered in our harbors. If the espionage measures had been law two months ago the Kronprinzessin Cecilie and the German ships in the Philippines would not now be useless hulks, but available tonnage, a hostage of Germany's good behavior. But better late than never; perhaps we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall save some of the German ships in New York from patriotic sabotage.

ONE clause in the espionage series has excited the violent opposition of many of our sincerest and most intelligent liberal thinkers. "Whoever in time of war, shall . . . spread or make reports or statements, or convey any information, with intent to cause disaffection in or to interfere with the operations or success of the military or naval forces of the United States" shall be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 and imprisonment for life or any period of less than thirty years. It is seriously argued that this provision would apply to the newspaper editor who should publish the truth about such matters as the embalmed beef scandal of Spanish War days. It must be borne in mind, however, that this law is to be administered by the civil courts, and that the federal attorneys would have to convince these courts that newspaper accounts of camp conditions, distributed among the stay-at-home population, would cause material disaffection in the army, or interfere with its operations. Whether such newspapers shall reach the enlisted man or not lies in the discretion of the military authorities, and any civil court would be certain to take this fact into account, in determining the question of guilt. In the matter of the Spanish War scandals, a reasonably competent court would have held that it was not the newspaper stories, but the embalmed beef, that was breaking the health and morale of the volunteer troops. As we now know, it was neither, but typhoid and other filth diseases, although this fact has no bearing on the moral.

WITH all due allowance for the tempering influence of the rule of reason in the administration of the law, we must accept the view that such restrictions upon freedom of speech and of the press are in themselves an evil, to be endured only under the threat of more serious evil. The question arises, what is the grave danger that forces us to adopt a measure like this? Let us recall a bit of our Spanish War history. Without assured command of the sea, we made our plans to throw an army of some 16,000 men into Cuba, defended by 195,000 Spanish soldiers, most of whom were regulars, seasoned and acclimated. From a conventional military point of view, the enterprise was a bold gamble, that could be expected to succeed only if executed as a surprise attack. But no sooner had we decided upon the Cuban campaign than our press began to publish in detail the facts pertaining to the number of our troops, their equipment, their movement to the point of embarkation, and even the probable points of attack. All this information was promptly cabled to Spain and thence to Cuba. We went lion-hunting with bows and arrows and a brass band. By our luck, not our merit, the lion proved to be on his last legs, stricken by maladies we knew nothing of. Our next enemy is likely to be more robust and more able to avail himself of information freely offered by a press preferring circulation to the success of the nation's undertakings.

AMONG the many opportunities at hand as the President begins his second term is one in particular which seems worth laying hold of. Mr. Wilson's first term marked the accomplishment of a legislative program that in the main reëlected him. His second might accent the improvement of the machinery which brought this legislation into existence, and was brought into existence by it. True, he no longer has the Congressional support that is thrown out dutifully to advertise the first-term President. But he begins his second term fettered by no partisan obligation. He is in debt to no medieval machine, no metropolitan or rural journalist. Good legislation need not cease when institutional improvement commences. But a budget, a departmental overhauling, a fight for the extension and the significance of the civil service, a conscientious attempt to vitalize the great commissions for which his own initiative is responsible—these are exploits with which to hold the many who voted strangely under a Democratic emblem last November. There are seas to be charted in international politics; there is a labyrinth at home. An institutional advance at all commensurate with his legislative accomplishment would establish Mr. Wilson's position as a forerunner in progressive achievement.

WOMAN suffrage has gained enormously by the extension to Ohio of the power of women to vote for President. It is not within the scope of the Ohio legislature to confer full franchise on the women of the state, but even this partial franchise has eminent political importance. Every state is a pivotal state for political purposes, but Ohio is really to be ranked with the eastern states of high population, and now, especially if Indiana joins it in making women presidential voters, the power of women in dealing with the national parties becomes formidable. It is this rather than any great virtue in exercising partial suffrage that will result from the action of the Ohio legislators. Full suffrage is the only kind that carries with it the possibilities of citizenship of which the vote is a symbol. But every extension is additional leverage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Armed Neutrality"

AFTER a protracted delay, during which the nation has waited impatiently for clear evidence of headway and direction in the policy of the administration, the President has finally acted. He has made another address to Congress, in which he renders an account of the situation and asks for authority to arm merchant vessels and for money to be used in protecting the property and lives of American citizens. His utterance, now that it has come, falls short of what the occasion required. He describes the situation of the country as "fraught with the gravest possibilities and dangers"; he declares "that the necessity for definite action may come at any time"; but he expressly declines to make definite proposals or to give any indication of the "form in which action may become necessary." Thus although he asks in substance for full authority, he considers it unwise to enlighten Congress or the country as to how the authority may or should be used. He asks them to be content with the assurance that war, if it comes, will be imposed upon him and not chosen by him. In the meantime he proposes an intermediate policy which is neither peace nor war and which is characterized as "armed neutrality."

There can be no objection to armed neutrality, provided it is understood to be a temporary expedient, designed to meet the necessity of keeping American vessels afloat. If carried out in a resolute and thoroughgoing way, it may well do the immediate job. Hitherto, according to the President's own account, German terrorism has been succeeding. It would not be unnatural for the Germans to anticipate that owing to American apprehensions, timidity and irresolution, they can, so far as this country is concerned, make the submarine blockade sufficiently effective without wasting torpedoes on American ships. It is necessary above all and at the earliest possible moment to dispel any such impression. The boats of the American line should sail for Liverpool loaded with the mail which constitutes the most essential part of our communications with Europe. They should be dispatched under government orders and armed fore and aft for adequate defense. The orders issued to the captain should be published and they should authorize him to consider the approach of any submarine a hostile act. The announcement should be made that the torpedoing of any one of them will be considered evidence of the existence of a state of war between Germany and the United States. Only by some such public and deliberate challenge can the effects of German terrorism be checked, and the vital national interests and the moral self-respect of the American nation vindicated.

Inasmuch as the "armed neutrality" proposed by the President provides a practicable method for deliberately challenging Germany to carry out her threats, it may be accepted for the present, but unless Germany should back down, it is an impossible permanent policy for any government with a record during the war such as that of Mr. Wilson. Even as a temporary expedient it presents grave dangers. If the neutrality for which we are arming is differential, it would be open to the criticism of being hypocritical and ineffective. If it were not differential, it would be disastrous. The phrase "armed neutrality" has been appropriated and rightly appropriated by William Randolph Hearst to describe the policy advocated by him—the policy of enforcing all American rights impartially and drastically against all belligerents. In his opinion Congress should itself define as a measure of American national policy what constitutes a merchant ship and a lawful voyage, and should grant to the President full authority to protect merchant ships during lawful voyages. It should also define lawful and unlawful blockades, and conditional contraband, absolute contraband and non-contraband goods. It should instruct the President to protect American ships in their right to pass through the lines of any blockade which has been defined to be unlawful. As the British blockade would have to be defined as unlawful, this policy would mean the use of naval or economic force not only to protect American vessels against torpedoes, but to break the British blockade. Unless Great Britain yielded, as she would not, we should soon be waging economic or actual war upon the Allies and using our power to secure German success. That would be the inevitable effect of a policy which by means of arms sought to enforce honest neutrality.

Neither is it out of the question that consequences similar to those described above may not follow from the official promulgation of a policy of arming merely to protect American neutral rights. As we go to press the Senate is considering a bill framed to carry out the President's policy which authorizes the commanders of American vessels to arm and defend them against "unlawful" attacks. Let us assume that there sails for a Dutch port an American vessel, whose captain considers the British orders to put into Halifax or Kirkwall to be "unlawful," as according to the precedents of international law they undoubtedly are. Let us suppose that the captain should resist the attempt of a British patrol to force on him obedience to these orders. Would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not the American government which was pursuing a policy of "armed neutrality" be obliged to back him up in his resistance? This hypothetical case is perfectly possible. It may occur whenever weapons are supplied to merchant captains, provided our policy remains officially one of arming to protect the rights under international law of individual citizens. It constitutes so grave a danger that, as we suggest elsewhere, the sinking of the Laconia should be made the excuse of declaring an immediate embargo on the export of all commodities which are not guaranteed against a destination to Germany. Such a measure would give official sanction to our past attitude of differential neutrality and would relieve our temporary policy both of an unpleasant hypocrisy and of a dangerous ambiguity.

The predicament in which the American nation now finds itself will never be properly understood until the fact of a previously existing benevolent neutrality is fully admitted. We are involved in our existing quarrel with Germany exclusively because we have never been honestly neutral. Germany would always have traded the submarine campaign on commerce for any action on our part similar to that advocated by Mr. Hearst, which would have tended to mitigate the British blockade. With such a record "armed neutrality" as a permanent policy would be tantamount to using force in order to sustain a subterfuge. Even so, it might be a conceivable policy, in case our benevolent neutrality had been based on a very small preference for one over the other group of belligerents, in case the security of the world's highway which is now being violated by Germany and policed by Great Britain was of minor importance to the United States, or in case we were a small and weak country, as we were in 1798, whose friendship or enmity would not be a factor of any importance making for the success of either group of belligerents. But all of these conditions are absent. The original preference of American public opinion for the cause of the Allies was emphatic and it has been enormously strengthened by the German invasion of the international maritime territory, whose inviolacy and good order is indispensable to American security. The success or the failure of the German aggression may depend upon whether or not it meets with sufficient resistance on the part of this country. If any nation were ever obligated to follow through on its own choice, that nation is the United States under the circumstances of the existing emergency. The time has come to show what it has meant by its benevolent neutrality, whether it means anything more than a weakness for indulging in conversation about our own rights and that of other people without any disposition to act so as to make those rights survive and prosper.

The truth of these contentions is in substance proclaimed by President Wilson in his recent address to Congress. "I am thinking," he said, "not only of the rights of Americans to go and come about their proper business by way of the sea, but also of something much deeper, much more fundamental than that . . . of rights which our hearts support and whose foundation is that righteous passion for justice upon which all law, all structures alike of family, of state and of mankind must rest, as upon the ultimate base of our existence and our liberty." If the goods which are imperiled by the German submarine warfare against commerce can be credited with a reasonable percentage of the social value attributed to them in the foregoing sentences, the policy of meeting the attack with no more than armed neutrality would be repellent in its timidity, and humiliating in its inconsistency and ineffectiveness. Armed neutrality means that if German submarines seek to destroy American property and life, a sufficient answer to the attempt is the armed protection of individual Americans in the pursuit of their lawful objects. It ignores the public significance of the German submarine campaign, the consequences of success or failure in pursuing the attack, and the effects of the national moral consciousness of returning so impoverished a retort to so ominous a challenge. We should be applying to one of the great crises in the world's history in relation to one of the most fundamental issues which has ever been raised between two nations, the weapons, the prejudices and the values of a helplessly and hopelessly legalistic provincialism.

To Defeat the Submarine

IMAGINE England at last forced to her knees, not by arms, for that is impossible, but by the agony of universal starvation, which may at least be conceived. Imagine that she has been forced to yield her fleet and to submit to the dismemberment of her colonial empire. Imagine so much, and logic will force you to go farther. You will see, as night follows day, a plunge of Russian power into the circle of German influence. Russia cannot stand alone; her western allies beaten into impotence, she must stand with Germany. You will see Japan fitting herself into the new scheme of German hegemony, reluctantly or with alacrity, it does not matter, for until her own wealth and might correspond with her ambitions, Japan must make her arrangements with those who rule the seas. What would be the position of the United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, in such a world? We should wish, with Jefferson, that a sea of fire parted us from the other continents. For we should not so soon win the Germans in their unexampled might to a kindly view of our behavior in this war.

All this is idle speculation? Yes, if the submarine campaign fails. As the Germans themselves keep repeating, by the submarine they will win everything, or suffer defeat. The submarine can't win, we reassure ourselves. The British navy will eliminate it. If there is no effective means at present for accomplishing this end, something will be invented. Why, let us hope for the best, by all means. But let us not make this hope do duty for action in the defense of our interest. It may not be comforting, but it is salutary to recognize the fact, which experience presses upon us day by day, that if the submarine is not so successful as the Germans had hoped, it is more successful than the British had feared. It is more successful, partly because its menace has driven our own ships to harbor. It will be a flat failure if we act to the utmost of our power upon a recognition of the fact that to leave the submarine undisturbed in its present measure of success may well mean the gradual wearing down of England's resistance, the dislodgment of her allies, a prolonged war and a peace dictated by Germany.

The submarine campaign has proceeded far enough for the observer to form a fairly definite conclusion as to its effectiveness. It is not isolating England. Germany may have a multitude of submarines, but she has not enough to patrol all the waters through which ships may approach the British Isles. The submarines may sink a certain number of the ships passing through the forbidden zone. It remains a small percentage of the whole. It can never be more than a small percentage, however furious the efforts of the submarine commanders.

But though the sinkings are a relatively small proportion of the ships that seek British ports, they have long exceeded in tonnage the total output of the British shipyards. Since the adoption of ruthless methods, the decline in net British tonnage has become more marked, and the neutral tonnage formerly serving Great Britain has largely been driven from the seas. What is occurring before our eyes is a war of naval attrition. Germany is sinking ships faster than Britain can build them. Not so much faster that the British can be forced to capitulate in six months, or eight, or ten, as the Germans fondly hoped. But in two years, or three, it is quite possible that the German design might succeed. With her able-bodied men at the front, with her remaining productive resources strained to the utmost in munitioning herself and her allies, it is not by any means impossible that England will in the end see her tonnage dwindling below the minimum essential to her existence. To be sure, England is accelerating her production of ships. But Germany is doubtless accelerating her production of submarines.

It is our legal right and national necessity to see that England is adequately provisioned. It has never been our desire to see Germany crushed; still less can we endure the reduction of England to vassalage. And this latter calamity we have the power to avert. Whether England can do so or not, we at any rate are in position to produce ships faster than Germany can sink them.

Let us not forget that the United States is the world's most powerful mechanical nation. Financially, the United States is without a peer. We have the skill, we have the material, the men and the money, to produce ships enough to carry to England what she needs, no matter what percentage of them is sunk. To build ships takes time, it may be objected. To be sure, but it is our special boast that we know how to abbreviate time, when we must. Grant that the submarine continues to prey without check for eight months; the existing and building tonnage in England and America will still suffice to meet the bare necessities of Great Britain. And if we set our great organizers at the task, at the end of eight months we can be launching ships faster than the Germans can sink them.

We need not build ships convenient to the designs of the commerce destroyers. The ships that carry the bulk of ocean freight were designed without thought of torpedoes launched against their bows. They are huge, slow, lumbering, difficult to manoeuver. They were built to operate cheaply. Such ships the submarine overtakes and destroys at its pleasure. We can build other types of ships that will wear the submarine down in their pursuit, and that, armed properly for defense, will acquit themselves well if overtaken. There is no insuperable technical problem in building ships that would baffle the pursuer's skill. Such ships cost money to build and money to operate. Money is all that stands in the way of our building them, except our incapacity to see the relation an energetic policy of shipbuilding bears to the future of the world.

Suppose we undertook to put our money into ships, should we lose it? Some of it, perhaps. If we entered upon a policy of defeating the submarine, it is probable that we should shorten the war to such an extent that we could not get back our investment through war freights. But what are a few tens of millions, or hundreds of millions of loss on ships rendered superfluous, as compared

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with what it would cost us in the future to defend ourselves against Germany, really possessed of world power?

What buoys up the German nation in its strivings for a peace based on conquest is faith in the success of the submarine campaign. This alone makes tolerable the prospect of another summer's desperate fighting on the western front. A partial success of the submarine campaign, with the prospect of reducing England to famine in another year, may reconcile the German nation to a prolongation of the war through 1918, whatever battering the armies of England and France may inflict in the field. Let it be understood that America means to thwart the submarine campaign, as she has the power to do, and Germany will be forced to recognize that no prolongation of the war can yield the fruits of victory. Peace will come, and a peace that will offer no premium upon aggression. The Germans have taunted us with our impotence to affect the outcome of the war. Our organizing power can destroy the German hope of victory, if we will but build ships. The vital need in the present crisis is simply stated—ships, more ships, ships built with the view to profit incidental and the view to international obligation foremost, ships armed and protected by a government fully alive to the supreme national interest.

In the Next Four Years

"The spirit of the nation is a great force, but it is one which cannot be always on the alert, and, while it sleeps, the part of noble institutions is to keep watch."
—F. S. Oliver on Alexander Hamilton.

A SUCCESSFUL President to-day is not a man working through noble institutions to clear ends, but a virtuoso trying by main force and personal authority to grind out a few crude results from a decadent political machine. For the first year or two of his term, perhaps under the pressure of an electoral campaign, a determined man can extract from Congress a few good pieces of legislation. Even then he has to buy this legislation at the expense of administrative efficiency. But when he has paid his price, exhausted the coercion of patronage, the institutions through which he works crumble in his hands. In the end he is left, as Woodrow Wilson is to-day, alone, the one source of energy in the government, and with a responsibility that it is beyond human power to fill.

There is an old saying that a good man can make any machine work well. It is not true of the American government as it is now organized. The concentration of all vitality in the Presidency has become something like a disease in which there is feverish activity at the center, a cold inertia in all the parts. We expect of one man that he shall speak for the nation, formulate its needs, translate them into a program. We expect that man to instill these purposes and this program into a parasitic party system, drive his own party to enact them, and create an untainted administrative hierarchy through which to realize his plans. We expect him to oversee the routine, dominate group interests, prepare for the future, and take stock of possible emergencies. No man can do it. We do not live in a world where individual genius alone matters. We live in a world in which intelligence must be collective, in which leadership itself requires a division of labor.

As the thing works to-day, if the President is absorbed in a foreign complication everything else comes to a dead stop. The affairs of the American people have to run on a single track, because the one responsible national officer has a single-track mind. It is no fault of Woodrow Wilson's. It is the fault of the institutions with which he is surrounded. It would be folly to suppose that any man could at one and the same time formulate the end of American isolation, play a part in the organization of world security, take charge of military reform, solve the railroad problem, prepare for the world-wide economic problems of the coming peace, know how to deal with food riots in New York, lay out our relations to Mexico and Latin-America, and keep the vast administrative organization of the government keyed up. Merely to meet crises as they are thrust upon him is an inhuman responsibility. Actually to lead the people towards a richer coöperative life, to intensify the war against poverty and ignorance and class rule, to integrate and democratize industry, to make education national and modern is something for which no one can be adequate. The President is burdened with the task of a benevolent despot and then denied the authority and resources to make even a despotism effective. In the system of checks and balances, it is the checks alone which seem to have much vitality.

As compared with the other great states of the world, the United States to-day is in point of organization one of the most backward and intellectually one of the most timid. Whatever else the war has done, it has at least taught England and Germany and Canada and France that large-scale operations can be planned and executed, that modern nations must think in very large sums of money, that the old scruples and dogmas of legalism and laissez-faire are old men's bogeys. These immutable laws of private profit and of "human nature" are shaken to the ground, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe is putting into effect the most drastic kind of collectivism. On its administrative side socialism has won a victory that is superb and compelling. In their severest trials the progressive nations have discovered that the old unorganized, competitive profiteering is unsound and wasteful. The very plans which were supposed to wreck human society have been adopted as a means of salvation. But the United States trundles along without nationalized railroads or shipping, its mineral resources unsocialized, its water power exploited, its fundamental industries whipped into competition, its food distribution a muddle, its educational system starved, its labor half organized, badly organized, and unrecognized in the structure of society.

In Europe the task of the democracies will be to capture the vast socialistic machines and operate them for the peace of democracy. In America the task is roughly speaking to create the administrative collectivism and at the same time strengthen and clarify popular control. It is a grim collectivism which Europe has established. It is dominated by a class and operated in the main by a bureaucracy. It has scant respect for liberty, it works through fear and compulsion. We shall have to establish much the same machinery, while we preserve the spirit and purpose of liberalism.

In reëlecting Woodrow Wilson America defeated a sally which promised neither to modernize the machinery of the nation nor to favor its popular aspiration. That President Wilson is a good democrat, that he is unafraid of the power of wealth and social position, that he is an enlightened internationalist has been demonstrated again and again. A genuine liberal may disagree sharply on many things he has done or failed to do, but beneath any disagreement there would remain a profound conviction that he has the will and the courage, though he may for lack of assistance frequently be without the knowledge and the means to do his part in making the world a juster and more humane home for men.

The translation of this faith into action is in overwhelming measure still to be done, and no matter what other problems of war and peace the next four years bring, the basic task of the President is to inaugurate the machinery of a democratic collectivism. It will mean, of course, in the first instance a still greater abandonment on Mr. Wilson's part of the whig doctrine with which he entered politics. It will mean a sharper personal conversion to the scale and motive of modern cooperation. Then it will require the assembling of like-minded men in his Cabinet and in the bureaus, for democratic collectivism is unworkable except through delegated authority, and authority delegated is intolerable where the officials are blind to the deeper purposes they are asked to execute. It will mean something still more spectacular. It will mean a war against that Congressional system which makes good administration impossible and turns almost all legislation into petty interference or sordid snatching. Congress will not reform itself. It will be reformed only from the outside by a President speaking for the nation.

When Mr. Wilson announces a sound and drastic social program and carries the fight to Congress for legislation to enact it and freedom to administer it, he will be acting on the faith, however dimly uttered, by which he was reëlected.

Organizing the Next House

WHETHER the new Congress meets in extra session, either at once or at a somewhat later date, or whether its first meeting comes regularly in December, the rôle it is to play will be an adventurous one. If it does not have to assume in extra session the responsibility of a war, it can scarcely escape the responsibility of a peace that will test its ingenuity no less thoroughly. Though the country must give the real answer, it is at least technically for the new Congress to decide whether at the conclusion of the war American resources are to be left in a precarious aloofness, or be put to the high purpose of maintaining international order.

The make-up of the Congress which is to bear even this reflected responsibility has accordingly assumed more than usual significance. Its upper house will not be greatly altered. By retaining their majority the Democrats have kept their hold on the committees, and no important chairmanship will change hands, even within the party, through the failure of the present occupant to secure reelection. How little different the new Senate will be, may be gauged by considering that it will contain only sixteen new members, that it will lose none of the men who have exerted any recent influence, and that it will still have Senator Stone as chairman of its Committee on Foreign Relations. If it varies from the old Senate it is apt to be only because outside pressure has varied. In the lower house, however, with neither major party holding a majority and the balance of power in the hands of six independents and members of minor parties, the possibilities of change are more numerous. If the Democrats are able to organize the House, only two important chairmanships will change hands: Rules, where Mr. Henry will give way to Mr. Pou; and Rivers and Harbors, where Mr. Sparkman's district activities came back upon him as a boomerang. If the Republicans secure con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol, all the committees, of course, will change hands. The alternatives presented in the more important chairmanships are these:

Committee	*Democratic Chairman*	*Republican Chairman*
Appropriations	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Gillett, Mass.
Foreign Affairs	Flood, Va.	Cooper, Wisc.
Commerce	Adamson, Ga.	Esch, Wisc.
Military Affairs	Dent, Ala.	Kahn, Cal.
Naval Affairs	Padgett, Tenn.	Butler, Pa.
Public Buildings	Clark, Fla.	Austin, Tenn.
Public Lands	Ferris, Okla.	Lenroot, Wisc.
Rivers and Harbors	Small, N.C.	Kennedy, Iowa.
Rules	Pou, N.C.	Campbell, Kans.
Ways and Means	Kitchin, N. C.	Fordney, Mich.

In most cases there is not a great deal to choose between the two alternatives. Where the present chairman happens to be alert, as in the case of the Committee on Public Lands, the Republican substitute is also satisfactory. Where the present occupant is less acceptable, as in the Committee on Public Buildings, a change of party would be splitting hairs. The real interest in the organization of the new House has been the hope that the independent members might bargain well enough with their balance of power to secure a radical reform in the rules. Such a reform, while primarily institutional, would influence the character of future domestic legislation and to a great degree clear the decks for whatever international responsibilities the House might have to assume.

The strategic position of the independents has been largely overestimated. They have been pictured as wielding a balance of power from day to day, while the two major parties struggled vainly for a majority. As a matter of fact, the House votes by roll-call only on infrequent occasions, and then usually when nothing whatever is at stake. During the session just completed the House appropriated over a billion and a half dollars, passed over two thousand measures, and considered more than two thousand others—and in the transaction of all its business there were less than fifty roll-calls, at least four-fifths of which were wasted on entirely minor issues. Moreover, even on the rare occasions when a roll-call vote occurs, the response is always incomplete. On the $368,000,000 Naval Appropriation bill, there were fifty-five absentees; on the question of passing the immigration bill over the President's veto, a roll-call which would seemingly attract as large an attendance as might ever be secured, thirty-seven members did not vote. In the face of such numbers as these, six independent votes massed for any purpose whatever would not cut much of a figure. They would have even less influence for the reason that, after the election of the Speaker, the voting is seldom along hard and fast party lines. It is rather believers in preparedness versus pacifist members, on a military bill; or rural representatives opposed to metropolitan members, on the question of pneumatic mail-tube service. The supposed strategic position of the independents rested on the assumption that 214 Democrats would almost continually oppose 215 Republicans on a roll-call vote. What usually happens is that several dozen Republicans and Democrats shout " aye " louder than several dozen other Democrats and Republicans shout " no," and the roll is never called. The fate of almost any minor piece of legislation depends entirely upon who happens to be in the chamber when the opportunity to vote is presented.

The one occasion propitious for independent action is, of course, on the election of the Speaker. Here the vote is complete, and along strictly party lines. A man may desert his party on social and economic grounds, but never on a moral issue. A Republican might without losing his party standing vote for a Democratic immigration bill or a revenue measure, but never for Champ Clark. In this fidelity to principle lay the one strategic opportunity of the independents. As to what revision in the rules was most worth fixing as the price of their support on the Speakership vote, all manner of advice has been offered. For the most part it has been impractical. To hold out for a budget or a public buildings commission would be sound in principle; but the independents would be apt to find themselves still holding out when the old guard on both sides had found a way to do without them. It is likely that half of the Democrats in the House would prefer James R. Mann to a public buildings commission, and certain that three-quarters of the Republicans would rather have Champ Clark than a budget.

There are obvious reasons for believing this to be true. To the party successful in organizing the House goes the election of the Speaker, the distribution of positions around the Capitol, and the control of the standing committees. The committee prerogative is a dominant influence, but compared with the calamities that might result from drastic changes in the rules—such as a budget system or a public buildings commission—it is almost superficial. There would be little political advantage in controlling the committees if the committees no longer controlled the roads to the national treasury. Rather than submit to the forfeiture of a power granted by the Constitution and more or less steadfastly abused ever since—the power of appropriating public funds—the majority on either side would prefer to see the House organized by the opposition. No congressman who honestly believes that the treasury belongs to the people by districts could hesitate over a choice between really drastic changes in the rules and a temporary control by the opposing party.

Assuming a genuine interest on the part of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

independents in effecting some sort of advance, their proper course was to set as the price of their support a reform possible to be obtained from the old-guard leaders, and at the same time actually a definite improvement. The two qualifications, it must be admitted, seem at first thought to be mutually exclusive. But it is possible to fasten upon a reform so simple as to receive public understanding and so logical as to catch public support. A demand on the part of the independents for an executive budget might safely be refused on the ground that no complete scheme had been put forward, or that the country was not ready for it. A demand that the complicated and powerful rules he made easier of amendment could be turned down behind a screen of technicalities. But there are reforms so blatantly obvious as to seem understandable even to districts that keep sending Cannon and Kitchin and Mann back to perennial reëlection. Such a reform is the insistence that there be voting by roll-call in the Committee of the Whole. It is in this technical status that the House considers bills touching appropriations and revenues—and in the Committee of the Whole voting by roll-call is not permitted. The result is obvious. Roll-call voting occurs chiefly on minor executive matters, and on many major issues the members of the House are permitted to dodge all responsibility. Of the fifty roll-calls during the recent session, seven were on the one question of whether a Democrat or a Republican should be appointed to the Board of Managers of the Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—while such steps as a measure conscripting labor in case of war, a refusal to extend the civil service, and the passage of a $250,000,000 army bill were all taken with only a viva voce vote.

The stock objection raised by members of the House to the roll-call is that it takes up too much time. This is true. A calling of the roll usually requires three-quarters of an hour—time for the large majority of the House that is always absent to get back into the chamber before the second reading is completed. It is frequently less a roll-call than a contest in mimicry—a performance to be eschewed by those who cherish a confidence in the dignity of popular representation. The second obvious reform which an independent group might take to itself would be the installation of a system of electrical voting. To cling to a time-wasting vocal call is as short-sighted as refusing to use a telephone. No propaganda would need be scattered to secure public support for a revision so obviously sensible. It is no more than a mechanical reform; but it would remove the objection to an extension of voting by roll-call, and thereby the fixing of an individual responsibility that is at present being dodged.

Unfortunately the independents are not well enough organized to carry a fight for even these simple proposals. They have met only once. They are self-conscious. They are aware what ridicule they can evoke, banded together for reform, and what popularity they can arouse by joining either party as individuals. If the House should be called together on Monday it is likely that the independent group will dissolve—though it is apt to be credited with forcing certain concessions of the sort the Progressives forced from the Republicans in Chicago last June. But if the House does not meet on Monday; if a month, two months, or the interval before December elapses before a session is called—then there is no reason why the independents cannot consolidate in earnest upon a simple program, and there is little excuse for them if they fail. They would not find it difficult to get the press and the country actively behind the demand that no matter how unintelligently members of the House vote they at least ought to vote in the open. Nor will they find unanimous opposition to this proposal within the House itself. That body is not so uniformly vicious and stupid as not to contain among its "regulars" many who would throw their support to a forward movement that has hitherto lacked an impetus. Whether the House meets in extra session or in December the independents have a rare chance for service. If with the support of the liberals in the major parties they can make the House assume a responsibility it was never intended should be dodged, they will have prepared the way for the intelligent consideration of progressive legislation. But whether or not they are successful, the fight for something fashioned along these general lines will one day have to be made.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN S. JOHNSON
GEORGE SOULE—Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Governors in 1917

SOME forty legislatures are again in session. As a result there is perturbation in some quarters, hope in others, interest among the politically curious, and much derision and abuse in the editorial columns. It is to the governor, however, rather than to the legislature that public attention is directed. As Mr. Wilson said while still governor of New Jersey, "The people are impatient of a President who will not formulate policy and insist on its adoption. They are impatient of a governor who will not exercise energetic leadership, who will not make his appeals directly to public opinion and insist that the dictates of public opinion be carried out in definite legal reforms of his own suggestion." The discriminating support given to many governors in last November's election is significant. What they have to say regarding the structural defects of state government deserves attention. If the utterances of this year's governors are any criterion of public feeling, we are about to enter an era of reconstruction and reform comparable to that through which the municipalities have been passing since 1900. To say the least, the messages and inaugural addresses constitute an admirable summary of needed changes.

The administrative side of state government is fundamentally defective and inasmuch as the governor is nominally the executive head of the system, much attention is devoted to its shortcomings. In Oregon, says Governor Withycombe, decentralization has more and more divested the chief executive of authority, and "the resulting decrease of individual responsibility lessens efficiency in public service." In Illinois, Governor Frank O. Lowden, whose inaugural message is one of the most instructive and suggestive documents of the year, has summarized conditions found in nearly all the states: "Administrative agencies have been multiplied in bewildering confusion. They have been created without reference to their ability economically and effectively to administer the laws. . . . Over one hundred officers, boards, agencies, commissions, institutions and departments are charged with the administration of our laws. No systematic organization exists and no adequate control can be exercised." "Kansas," says Governor Capper, "has admittedly outgrown our present system of government. It is a hodge-podge; a patch-work; antiquated, cumbersome, wasteful, inefficient, entirely out of keeping with the more scientific systems of business now employed by private concerns and many other states. A multiplicity of boards, commissions, bureaus, and departments duplicate the work of one another, divide responsibility which should be concentrated, and by interfering with one another often retard the public business." These statements are indicative of the general situation, and nearly every governor advocates the same remedy, a greater or less degree of reorganization and consolidation. There are few sectional or local differences in the demand. It appears alike in "radical" Kansas and "reactionary" Vermont, in Republican Illinois and Democratic Missouri. Several governors supplement the demand by recommending the creation of a state purchasing department and a permanent civil service. Hiram Johnson's comments on California's successful experience with these institutions deserve attention.

But only a slight improvement will result from consolidation of administrative agencies if they remain as at present under independent elective heads whose power is coördinate with that of the governor. Control by the chief executive is imperative if the state is to have an efficient administration. It means an increase of the governor's appointive power and a consequent reduction in the number of elective officials. "West Virginia," says Governor Hatfield, "will never have a responsible form of civil government—a government promptly responsive to the mandate of the voters—so long as seven independent administrations in the state capitol at Charleston perform the functions of government, with no central control or responsibility." The cabinet system of the national government is needed in the states. Says Governor Lowden: "The governor is held responsible for the conduct of the state government. His executive functions should be discharged through a limited number of agencies over which he may exercise actual control." The same demand appears in Wisconsin, Washington, South Dakota, New Hampshire, and Kansas. In both Wisconsin and Kansas the governor urges a four year term.

Closely related to the problem of executive control of departments is that of responsibility for the enforcement of law throughout the state. Law enforcement has been local and therefore difficult when local interests and prejudices are concerned. Law makers have thus been encouraged to pass foolish and unnecessary measures, relying on local nullification to avert any unpleasant consequences which might result from enforcement. A year ago Governor Stuart described a common situation when he declared that the dependence of the central

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority upon the local had made Virginia, "so far as the enforcement of the criminal laws is concerned, a helpless aggregation of independent counties and cities instead of a sovereign state responsible for the execution of her laws throughout her entire borders." This year's messages recognize the same condition—the rapid spread of prohibition emphasizing the need of centralized control. Of what use is it, ask the governors of a dozen states, for the constitutions to charge faithful execution of the laws if the necessary power to control subordinate officers is withheld? "I believe," declares Governor Manning of South Carolina, "that the governor should be held responsible for the enforcement of law. If he is held responsible for it, he should be given the power to require local peace officers to discharge their duties, or, upon failure to do so, to suspend such officers." In New Hampshire, South Carolina, and South Dakota the creation of a state constabulary is suggested.

The discussions of finance disclose a serious situation. Governor after governor recites the same dreary story, insufficient revenues, reckless appropriation, waste and extravagance everywhere. A very few governors, notably those of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Washington, report full treasuries, coupled with a solemn warning that this must not serve as an excuse for a carnival of spending. The remedy for the worst abuses lies in the adoption of an executive budget, which, however, involves the abandonment of one of our most sacred political fetishes—the separation of powers. Governor Lister of Washington describes the proposed system. "The governor, as chief executive officer for the state, ought to have the full responsibility for the preparation of the budget placed upon him. The legislature ought to retain to itself the right to reduce any amounts he might recommend in the budget; but to make the budget truly effective, the legislature ought not to have the power to increase amounts recommended." On November 7th, Maryland adopted a constitutional amendment embodying these principles and adding the words, so subversive of our older theory, "The governor and such representatives of the executive departments, boards, officers, and commissions of the state expending or supplying for states' money as have been designated by the governor for this purpose, shall have the right, and when requested by either house of the legislature, it shall be their duty, to appear and be heard with respect to any budget bill during the consideration thereof, and to answer inquiries relative thereto." The power to veto items, granted the governor in the constitutions of many states, is at best a negative power, often ineffective, frequently abused. Nearly every governor recommends a budget system of some kind, those of Maine, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Kansas specifying the Maryland type.

The legislative branch of government receives comparatively little attention, perhaps because the governor is unwilling to antagonize at the outset a coördinate power on whose coöperation he is dependent for a successful administration. Nevertheless, in two states, Washington and South Dakota, the governor recommends a smaller unicameral body, and in Wyoming a sweeping reduction in the size of both houses is urged. Governor Lister suggests that five members from each of the five congressional districts of Washington would be sufficient. Several remark that the growth of non-partisan voting seen in last November's elections indicates that sooner or later party designations must be removed from the state and local ballot.

From the above remarks it is possible to make a few general deductions regarding the trend of government in the states. There is little new in the discussion of its defects. Extravagance and inefficiency have long been recognized. What is new, however, is the proposed method of reform. The direct primary has undoubtedly come to stay but the governors comment on it only as still defective and unsatisfactory. Similar are the comments on the initiative and referendum. In South Dakota, Governor Norbeck frankly admits that eighteen years' experience has proved a disappointment to its most enthusiastic champions, of whom he had been one. The weapon designed to protect the people from predatory interests has fallen into the hands of the enemy and is being used against those it was intended to protect. "Nearly everybody appears to be willing to sign these petitions," he remarks pathetically. The primary and direct legislation have not had the desired results. They aggravated a condition already bad—the voter's burdens were already too great.

That there must be changes is apparent. The theory as to the objects of American government has changed. "We cannot return to the simplicity of the fathers if we would," says Governor Graham of Vermont. "The state," says Governor Lowden, "has everywhere taken on new functions which it will not relinquish. . . . An industrial age, whether we desire it or not, imposes new obligations on the state. To meet these obligations democracy must show an increasing efficiency in government." Governor Cox of Ohio expresses the same idea, "Government under modern auspices is given enlarged functions. We are finding out that the government which belongs to the people can render service to them which was not at-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempted under the old order." Although a majority of the governors advise a reduction in the amount of law making, they proceed in most cases to disregard their own warnings and to recommend extensive programs of social legislation, industrial regulation, elaborate schemes of social insurance, conservation of resources, improvement of public health and many other projects for human betterment. In the Dakotas, Washington, and Montana, state owned terminals and elevators are proposed. The police power is everywhere expanding. Truly, as Hiram Johnson says of California, "to many and varied activities a new philosophy of government has given an impetus which no reaction can check." But an increase in state functions means more money, more public officials, more taxation, more strain on an organization everywhere denounced as wasteful, inefficient, irresponsible. No good citizen can picture with equanimity a system of social insurance controlled by an irresponsible elected politician, administered by short term political appointees, unchecked by ordinary business methods.

If the state has become an agency for the accomplishment of positive good, governmental organizations must undergo a corresponding change. In the words of Arthur Capper, "We have relied too much upon the Bird o' Freedom, the Star-Spangled Banner, political windjamming, and campaign buncombe, and not enough upon plain business sense. Self-government has not failed. But we have not had self-government. We have left self-government to precedent, and indifference, and red tape, and expediency; and all the other attendants of mismanagement and bad government." There is evidence that the era of wind jamming is passing. The governmental changes advocated this year are not in the realm of speculative politics. Governor Edge's conception of the governorship as that of business manager for the varied interests of New Jersey is essentially practical. The principles of responsibility, proper division of functions, gradation of authority, are operative in any successful corporation and in many cities. Administrative reorganization and a cabinet system will produce a governor who can really govern. An executive budget will result not only in immediate economy and greater efficiency, but will offer possibility of positive leadership by a responsible executive now lacking in all our legislatures. It means positive and effective government. Governor Lowden says of those who drew up the constitutions now in force in many states: "They labored under the delusion that they could shackle the legislator's power for evil and still give his virtues full play. In this they were wrong, as we now plainly see. To withhold necessary power from a public official because he may abuse it, is to confess the failure of our form of government."

Changes in the legislative branch will be slower in coming, but they will occur sooner or later. Probably, with the growing recognition of the fact that the problems of the state are essentially non-political, the bicameral system will go as it has already gone in most cities. With a responsible and efficient legislature, the legislative power of the courts will diminish and there may result an abandonment of the elective system, permanent tenure, and a grant of real authority so much needed in the administration of justice. It means a return to the better principles of the old Federalism—strong, energetic government, able to accomplish positive results, but unlike Federalism, based on and controlled by the common sense of twentieth century democracy. These results may be long in coming. The fact that the governors are willing to advocate such changes at least indicates that a considerable body of the public is willing to listen. Much educational work must still be done. The fate of the New York constitution at the hands of the voters in 1915 should be a warning to the conventions soon to meet in several states.

W. A. Robinson.

Mr. Lloyd George's War Conference

When Mr. Lloyd George, on becoming first minister, invited the premiers of the overseas dominions to London, he started a train of eager inquiry within every school of imperialist opinion. For in these days the problem of the empire is vividly and concretely before us; and any move that betokens an approach to further unity comes under our careful scrutiny. The early press notices proclaiming an imperial conference conjured up apprehensions that far-reaching schemes of empire reorganization were in prospect. But these have been stilled by later reports explaining that only a war council is intended. A war council is obviously restricted to certain immediate business in hand; which in this case means the further prosecution of the war and an interchange of views concerning peace. The premiers of the dominions and a representative from India will sit informally as members of Mr. Lloyd George's war committee; their deliberations will be confined to a discussion of ways and means out of the present struggle. Yet the fact that the dominions and the mother country are to draw together around a common council table, with more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a cohesive impulse than they have ever betrayed before, is in itself a manifestation of a changing imperial system. If there be anything in the oft-repeated suggestion that the reciprocal relations of the dominions and the mother country can never remain the same after the war as before—and more than one member of the British Cabinet has declared such to be his views—this war council will probably have an important bearing upon imperial reconstruction.

The more conspicuous group of imperialists, described best perhaps as federationists or philosophical unionists, have entertained for some years a scholarly and academic interest in empire reorganization as the master problem in English government. Through the Round Table they have conducted a propaganda that is bringing an increased number of university and professional men to an enlightened interest in a higher political integration. Their project of a commonwealth, involving a super-parliament for the empire (under the leadership and for the greater glory of such proconsular celebrities as Curzon and Milner) embodies the results of much ingenious reflection upon the historical experiences of federalism. Their constitution-making has been a formidable task in political science, pursued in the confidence that a plan of federation framed in advance of its actual need would of itself foster the cohesive impulse. They have foreseen the advantage of directing the force of this impulse according to a well prepared scheme, instead of resorting, when the time for action arrives, to some device that might be extemporized.

The degree of unionism which the Round Table group advocate is not likely to commend itself to the more conservative feeling of colonial nationalism, with its sectional interests and its proclivity for distinctiveness that may prove irreconcilable with any well devised exercise of higher sovereignty. For colonial nationalism constitutes a very jealous and sensitive body of opinion, even though no imperial Gladstone has yet come forward to voice its instinctive repugnance towards this higher integration, with its unwarranted assumption that in a broad-constructionist unionism lies the only imperial loyalty worth considering. Quite significant is it that one of Mr. Lloyd George's secretaries is a promoter of the Round Table movement. If Mr. Lloyd George himself is captured by its advocates the chances for a unionist program are strong. It is generally expected that the war council will not adjourn without some reference to the future consolidation of the empire; and, unless present intimations are entirely misleading, it will suggest by way of resolution the gathering in the immediate future of some imperial convention for the purpose of contriving some redistribution and readjustment of imperial power.

Should the war council in this respect result in nothing more than the calling of a constitutional convention, the achievement would be noteworthy. The prevailing apathy within the dominions towards any unionist program, and the jealousy of sectional interests since colonial industrialization, will subject any scheme of federation to an abundance of interested criticism. For it is a mistake to imagine that the dominions are dissatisfied with their estate and seek emancipation from a restricted sovereignty. On the contrary, the movement towards a higher organization comes from the mother country to the dominions as a persuasive appeal to share the burden of imperial defense. If, after the war, the assistance is to be regular and permanent, it can scarcely be asked for except through constitutional means —which implies an overhauling of constitutional machinery for securing a concerted control over expenditure for a concerted policy. The problem of future organization is thus bound up with the question of a redistribution of the expense of an armament in time of peace. And that is the question which can hardly be decided till the war is over. Nor is it as simple as the paper constitution of the Round Table propaganda would seem to infer. Yet the general participation of the dominions in the war furnishes ground for believing that the present emergency, by over-riding all precedent, has forced a new departure in general control; and that the active share in the offensive against Germany may perpetuate itself in a continued systematic correlation of the empire's war strength.

In the meantime the deliberations of the war council cannot be without some determining effect upon this very question. The situation will be one in which tact may accomplish miracles by feeling its way deftly towards the ultimate working theory of the empire. The slightest spark of ungraciousness may do incalculable harm. Fortunately Mr. Lloyd George's very human way of not talking down from a high official altitude will help to smooth out suspicions and keep the discussions upon an agreeable plane. Canada has least, in fact nothing, to expect from peace terms. But South Africa and Australia are directly concerned in the disposition of Germany's conquered colonial territory. A recent pronouncement, that these two dominions would retain their acquisitions at the peace, requires to be confirmed by the council. Otherwise South Africa's and Australia's inclination towards further political integration might be arrested seriously. But the claims of South Africa

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and of Australia seem of small moment comparatively beside the question of India—if the representation of India at the council be anything more than an empty formality. If we are to have a constitutional convention subsequent to the war council, it is obvious that its success must depend largely upon the good fortune of the war committee in meeting the just expectations of the dominions and of India at this present juncture.

C. E. FRYER.

Montreal.

Portrait of a Congressman

WE moved away from Slocum County before I ever had a chance to discover whether Frank Boody had the beedle eyes, the heavy jowl and the vest covered with myriads of dollar marks that the newspaper cartoonists always gave him. "Boody, alias Boodle," they called him, though everyone knew that he was the boss of Slocum County. Whoever sought a postmastership or a pension from the government or a place on "the citizens' receiving committee" when the governor came to town, had first to win his favor. Dark stories were whispered about the run he was making for Congress; even his friends admitted that he had been chosen for the place because he "had something" on the state auditor. He was unscrupulous, I was told, crude, selfish, and tyrannic.

A month ago, at a Sunday concert in Washington, I looked up from my program and glanced for the first time into the beedle eyes of Frank Boody. He was sitting just across the aisle from me, with one solid leg buckled under the other. He looked younger than he did in the cartoons, but the heavy jowl was there—only, it was more a neck than a jowl, and partly hidden by a bright necktie. His mouth was slightly open, and he frowned, but at least he was not actively disturbed by what the musicians were playing. At his side sat a timorous little woman who never took her eyes off two senators' wives in a box, and a stripling daughter who never took her eyes off the telephone numbers she was scratching with a pin-point on the varnished back of the chair in front of her. These latter two I identified, after some effort, as Mrs. Boodle and Baby Boodle, who, across three columns of newspaper space, and with alarming grimaces, once ate a pie all dotted with dollar signs—while a hungry person labelled "The People" looked enviously in through the window. What Boody "had" on the state auditor was evidently enough to send him to Congress.

In the month that has passed since I first looked into the beedle eyes I have developed an intimacy with their owner. I have learned, for example, that Boody did not come to Washington with the social ambitions that are popularly attributed to him. He did not expect to dance Saturday evenings at the White House or to lead the cotillon with the wife of the senator from Massachusetts. Neither did he quite expect, I fancy, that his closest acquaintance would turn out to be a tin-roofing man who lived in the apartment next door and a dentist who was equally fond of trap-shooting. For he confessed that the phonograph records he had prevailed upon Mrs. Boody to pack at the last minute—other representatives and their wives would be calling, now and then—have lain untouched in the bottom of the trunk. I know, too, that Boody does not wear the baggy black cutaway the newspaper artists put on him. He wears, in fact, much worse. On week-days it is a brown tweed, with an English cut to the shoulders; on Sundays it is apt to be a gayer hue, with a sewed-in Norfolk, perhaps. Boody's ideas of a gentleman's wardrobe have changed since he came to Washington, but no more than his ideas on a good many other things. He thought, during his first few weeks at the Capitol, that Statuary Hall embodied practically all that was permanent in art. He used to go out of his way to pass through the Hall and admire William King, with the little stone tassels on his knee-boots, and Stephen F. Austin, standing off in a corner with a stone map of Texas in his hand. But of late he has learned that this pantheon is known as the Chamber of Horrors, and that the thing to do is to scoff at its ponderous marbles. When Boody passes through Statuary Hall to-day it is with a sarcastic word for Austin's map and King's boot-tassels, though he can never quite bring himself to sneer at Benton of Missouri, who stands over against the east wall with an acorn on his watch-fob. Before Benton he still spends an occasional quarter-hour in contemplation, though at his office this would be stoutly denied. There you get the impression that it is all Boody can do to attend the meetings of the Committee on the Census—and find time to eat and sleep. He is a difficult man to secure an interview with. Hinting that you have come straight from the Executive Offices or that you may be carrying an important message from the State Department gets you little satisfaction. Mr. Boody is always at a meeting of the Committee on the Census, unless it develops that you are a voter from Slocum County—a bait which invariably brings him dashing around from behind the screen which separates his office into two sections. Finally, I have learned that "the interests" which sent Boody to Congress were chiefly the Modern Woodmen of America and the Slocum County Fair Association. A lobby

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is for him only a place to smoke cigars when the roll isn't being called. I don't believe that he would accept a bribe if it were offered to him, but there is slight chance that that will ever happen. Boody is too good a party man to be influenced by a bribe.

In the matter of training, Boody is better equipped than our political essayists acknowledge. He has never heard of the Fabian Society or the Holy Alliance or Jeremiah Bentham; but he does know Nicholas Murray Butler, the Malthusian theory and the Battle Cry of Peace. His knowledge of American history stops short of The Federalist and the development of the two-party system, but he knows that the panic of 1893 was due to a low tariff and that the only thing that has saved this country from repeated invasions is the Monroe Doctrine. Theoretical economics he has little patience with; what he knows comes from practical experience—that the prosperity of the country is measurable by subtracting the value of imports from exports, and that the collapse of the Populist party exposes the sophistry of government ownership. He is opposed to any idea of a League to Enforce Peace, not because of Washington's warning against entangling alliances—he realizes that times have changed and that isolation may no longer be possible—but because it is none of our business what happens in Europe or Asia Minor, or in China, for that matter. Besides, a League to Enforce Peace might bring us into such cordial relations with other countries that we should find it difficult to protect our industries properly against competition. And then where would our prosperity be? "Preparedness" he heartily commends—not so heartily, perhaps, as he did when the weather was warm enough to have parades, but still heartily enough to provide us with adequate protection against Canada. Canada, as anyone who lives near the border and has had his constituents' fish-nets pillaged knows, is the one ever-present source of danger. The way to meet it is by putting universal military training into our schools. Boody scouts the idea that carrying a wooden gun begets patriotism; but he believes that every youth must be taught at an early age that he owes his country something more than getting a good education. The girls, too; let them pick up the principles of first aid. A girl as well as a boy ought to grow up a responsible citizen. Woman suffrage Boody has little sympathy with—not because he takes much stock in the argument that a woman's place is in the home — a good woman would know *that,* whether she had suffrage or not—but because there is a fundamental psychological difference between men and women. A woman is not capable of ever becoming a responsible citizen. On the question of restricting child labor Boody is unqualifiedly pro. Regarding workmen's compensation he is anti. It smacks of paternalism, and paternalism leads to syndicalism, syndicalism to militarism—and there you have it. The United States must never be given so powerful a central authority that we shall be tempted to invade a small sovereignty. What to do in Mexico is a more difficult question. Boody, though of the opposing party, is not one to condemn the President's policy without reservation, or to belittle the difficulties attending our job there. Nor is he a rampant annexationist. At the same time, he does feel that the only way to restore order is for the United States to take over the northern part of Mexico. If we had a strong central authority it would be easy, and we could do a lot for that part of the country as far south, say, as Chihuahua. Any such responsibility, Boody admits, would have to be accompanied by an increased efficiency in our own government. The Congressional machine, though Boody is proud to be a cog in it, is by no means perfect. It needs to be patched up here and there; made more business-like. But not by establishing an executive budget. That would destroy the very essence of constitutional government and take the responsibility out of the hands of the direct representatives of the people. They were elected to bear that responsibility, and they must not attempt to dodge it. "Pork" he is unalterably opposed to. He believes that each representative should be treated squarely, and that there should be no sectionalism in the distribution of public buildings and river improvements. "United we stand, divided we fall," is his motto.

What political future lies ahead of Boody I do not know. Unfortunately he has been started in on a committee with so many young members that he cannot possibly outlive them all and attain the chairmanship — and the committee has so little power that it wouldn't matter much if he did. Nor does he seem strong enough to go far, without committee prestige to aid him. He is well fitted for his ordinary duties; he is industrious in the matter of pensions, forceful in his portrayal of the need for local post-offices and federal dredging, systematic in the records he keeps of his constituents' seed preferences. But he is not shrewd enough to be admitted into his party councils, and he is too good an orator to be of much use on the floor of the House. Of course there is still another road to fame; he might decide to give up pensions and public buildings, and devote his successive reëlections to securing improvements in the rules of the House. He might—but then he would never be reëlected.

CHARLES MERZ.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William M. Chase

AN article that should do full justice to William M. Chase ought to be written by one who had known him personally and had followed up his work from year to year, rather than by one who had seen his pictures only occasionally and who has to get his impressions mainly from a memorial show. Chase was a teacher as well as a painter, a notable influence in the development of American painting, and from the exhibition of his work at present at the Metropolitan Museum one gathers only fragmentarily the significance that his abundant production must have had—especially in his middle period—on the youth avid of accomplishment in the business of painting. However, it may be of some interest to find what such an exhibition, taken by itself, has to tell about the man who impressed himself so strongly upon successive student generations in America. That the result will be less favorable than would be the alternative judgment is quite certain, for Chase was not the painter of definitive, concentrated masterpieces. He painted largely and freely and was a constant though not a painful student, and therefore, though this collection may fairly illustrate him, it does not adequately present him. Especially there is a dearth of the brilliant still-lifes for which he is so well known.

The first thing that strikes one about the exhibition is the characteristic that has led so many persons to speak of his variety and versatility. These words mean many things, and there is little question that it is not the best of these meanings that applies to Chase. At best variety does not mean merely all sorts of subjects and all sorts of moods, but it implies as well a central poise that makes the varied expressions essentially one. In the case of Chase one is struck rather by the difference between various canvases than by their variety. I have seen many retrospective shows, but never have I seen another where the artist was so hard to find or where there was so little suggestion of a definite evolution. Growth there is both as to increase of technical mastery and in maturity of point of view, but what is lacking is the evidence that connects the man who painted the earlier pictures with the later ones, or even with pictures not at all remote in time. If one compares him with Pissaro, who was deeply influenced by the methods of various men, even late in life, but ever gave his own distinctive version of the influencing factor, one notes the difference. There is no danger of mistaking Chase's Leibl, Stevens, Whistler, Sargent, for the real Leibl, Stevens, Whistler or Sargent, but when one tries to find the distinctive Chase character in the canvases that markedly show these influences, one is in difficulty. The pictures are coarser than the originals; their distinctive poise, the expression in color, line or composition that points their peculiar emotional tone is gone; and one wonders what has been given to replace it. One gets hardly more than a strong suggestion of a man who likes to paint, who likes things and likes to see them, and who has an eye for the picturesque though without any picturesque of his own. One feels the craftsman's purpose and one wonders whether there is any purpose beyond this.

This kind of limitation makes it inevitable that Chase's composition in line and mass and color is never decisive. Sometimes in the smaller canvases it is charming, almost exquisite indeed, but never quite. It is as though it were a regrettable necessity that in order to paint one had to compose at all when the real fun lay in brush and color. However, since composition of a kind was needed somebody else's would do admirably. Of course I do not mean to imply that Chase was really not solicitous about this. He may well have been, but he had no particular compositional need and so he either saw composition in terms of another or else was satisfied with the commonplace picturesque. Occasionally this picturesque is very happy but never anything more.

One certainly gathers that Chase enjoyed the things he painted, that he liked the people and the things even when he was not painting them, and that when he was not painting them he wished he were. He differs from a Cézanne, who did not care much what he painted. Cézanne was interested in his picture and would make a picture out of anything. He differs from Whistler, who was immensely interested in things and people, but only now and again saw just the thing that his peculiar feeling called for. Chase, one gathers from this exhibition, was more open and more catholic. The object does not, as for Cézanne, merely serve to aliment the picture, nor does it as for Whistler constitute some rare Whistlerian vision. He painted all sorts of things and he painted them in all sorts of ways according to the particular stage of his technical progress, of the moment's influences or the moment's inspiration. His compositional determinants were not his own; he sees quite without personal prejudice or purpose; the object and the moment's mood or reminiscence does the rest.

It is then Chase's technical mastery and his interest in painting pictures of "things" that constitute him a painter worthy of consideration. His portraits of men: Mr. Windmuller, shrewd and whimsical; Lt. Monell, grave and sensitive; Mr. Gwathney with a suggestion of wanting no non-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense about it; Clyde Fitch with something foreseeing and emphatic; and himself erect, alert, incisive, all these suggest the man who was very human himself and to whom others were human also. His children are thoroughly sympathetic and it is only in the case of women that he does not seem to get far beyond the arrangement. He is apparently too good an American to be a painter of women.

The landscapes are by all odds the weakest things in the show, and this is no doubt intelligible enough. To paint landscape importantly, one must have either a strong feeling for volume or space or color, or else one must have a distinctive sentiment or interpretative attitude toward it. Landscape is so free, so variously plastic both formally and emotionally, that even a clever painter cannot make much of it unless he really has something to say about it. Chase has not much to say about anything that the object does not pretty definitely point toward, and so in landscape where the pointing is rather vague he does not get beyond the obvious and insignificant.

His interiors on the other hand are among his pleasantest things, especially the later ones at Shinnecock. There is in them a gracious sympathy and clarity, an order and harmony that is quite exceptional and alluring, and they are in spirit the happiest expressions of his brush and palette.

The still-lifes end the series of the pictures and they are in a sense the most distinctive tests of Chase's talent. Portraits of men are interesting as personal presentations, but fish and fruit and dishes are just mere stuff for the painter. To some extent they are generally interesting. There is a satisfaction in the mere seeing of things, and to the mass of people pots and pans and furniture and food and other odds and ends, are so obviously made for other purposes than to be just seen, that one all the more likes to look at them when they exist for that purpose alone. The painter is professionally concerned with this matter of mere visibility and therefore still life, especially of the lowly kind, so commonly appeals to him. He may put it in the foreground of his canvas or it may be accessory, his interest may be continuous or occasional, but it is rarely completely absent.

It is then very much to the purpose that Chase with his enthusiasm for seeing things should be a still-life painter. But on the other hand his special interest in big fish and notably big faience and brass pots is also symptomatic. Of all non-sentimental still life (such as flowers or arms) they are with their bulging mass and sweeping line the most expressive. Chase seems to take a saturated satisfaction in the swell and swing of the thick soft-bodied fish. They give far more result at a lesser price of organization than groups of smaller or less expressively shaped objects. The compositions of fruit of which there are several in the memorial collection are too loose, too uncertain in their putting together to be very satisfactory. The best of them is made of characteristically large objects but even so it is not welded but merely assembled. Although these pictures are well painted they are too imperfectly pictured. They show the need of more thought or feeling to carry their volume of execution.

The net result then of this exhibition is to convince one that Chase is not a painter whose work as a body can endure. Many things may well give lasting pleasure, but there is no suggestion of a central personality from which each canvas flows and on which each canvas throws a light. Although he painted much and well it is very doubtful whether he can ever have the importance for posterity that he had for his contemporaries. At a time when good craftsmanship in America was rare he taught its value but he had probably too little besides that craftsmanship to assure his own enduring fame.

LEO STEIN.

At the Capitol

THE last session of the Sixty-fourth Congress ended as it began, in a run of oratory that was not always coherent and seldom well directed. Events of the last three months afforded a continuous invitation to rhetoric. In rapid succession came the President's December note to the belligerents, his address to the Senate on the subject of peace, his notification in joint session of the dismissal of the German ambassador. To these successive chapters the Senate, bound in no way by a cloture restriction, addressed itself at times almost single-mindedly. Discussion of the various foreign situations was only exceeded, in length, by the debate arising over the taxation of oleomargarine, and in vehemence only by the struggle over pneumatic mail-tube service. Toward the end of the session what had been going on all along was branded as a filibuster.

Meantime the House, equally desirous of participating in the discussion, but under the restraint of its "five-minute" rule, fretted at the other end of the Capitol. No parliamentary code, however, could check its interest. Members interrupted agricultural bills with speeches on naval affairs, and naval bills with addresses on international problems. An orderly plan which might have drawn some benefit from a discussion obviously irrepressible was lacking. By moving technical amendments to bills under consideration, and thereby securing a precious five minutes, which might by indulgence be extended to ten, many war and peace speeches were made with only the brief interruptions caused by the reading of some totally irrelevant bill. Nor was the House wholly limited to this capsular imitation of the Senate. Throughout the session it had its own inducements to discussion: its peace leak investigation, with several days of non-partisan exhortations for a thoroughgoing inquiry, regardless of the incriminating

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequences. It had its all-day debate on the transferral of five retired army officers to the active list, and its all-night dispute over the appointment of a new member to a complimentary commission. Figures are meaningless unless they are enormous: the Congressional Record for a session of sixty-eight days contains thirty-seven million words.

This vast literature is innocuous in itself—but it tends to obscure what was actually accomplished in the meantime. Especially since the end of the session came in the tumult of a filibuster is the legislative record apt to be lost sight of. A few days before actual adjournment that record consisted of 2399 bills. It seems extraordinary that so much legislation could be enacted in the face of so much oratory; but that the figure represents an activity that did not really exist is indicated in a classification of the measures passed.

Pension bills	2193
Bills settling claims	85
Bills of an administrative nature	83
Amendments to the judicial code	15
Appropriation bills	14
Major public bills	9

In this summary, which the events of the last few days of the session may alter in detail but not proportionately, the specialization in administrative matters is clearly indicated. Neither of the two lines along which most was accomplished—pensions and claims—seems a proper subject for legislation. Members of Congress have replied to the criticism bestowed on the pension practice by pointing out that many honest claims fall outside the set regulations, and so require a special statute. What merits criticism in the matter of pensions is not the individual bill, which may be meritorious enough, but the failure to transfer to the Bureau of Pensions the powers of discrimination which apparently fit Congress for the work. By placing both pensions and claims in executive keeping, Congress would be rid of a practice deplored by the wiser members and abused by the many small jobbers.

Though the pension bills and the settlement of claims together represent more than ninety-five per cent of the legislation enacted during the session just ending, they by no means imply that a corresponding amount of time was given to their consideration. After a member introduces a pension bill he is so completely relieved of any responsibility for it that he frequently introduces a second one, forgetful of his earlier effort. In batches of two hundred these bills are put through, with no discussion, no dissenting vote and practically no one present. They waste the time of only the pension committees, which are for the most part made up of that sort of member whose time is better wasted in pensions than in more hazardous fields of legislation. Committee attention likewise suffices for many of the bills listed above in the third class, as bills of an administrative nature. In this division are placed the twenty-four laws enacted during the recent session to give this or that railroad the right to build one particular bridge; the thirty measures dealing with land matters of a minor sort; and the seven bills that were passed to permit various steamers to change their names. Like the pension bills and the settlement of claims, these matters seem more properly fit to occupy the attention of a departmental bureau than a national legislature. As for the balance of the eighty-three bills listed in this division, they comprise a variegated assortment difficult to group, and often arousing considerable discussion before passage: an act granting a badge to the United Daughters of the Confederacy of Virginia; a law moving the statue in Dupont Circle, Washington; an act "prohibiting the interment of any person in the cemetery of White's Tabernacle, No. 39, of the Ancient United Order of Sons and Daughters, Brethren and Sisters of Moses."

When the achievements of the recent session have been sifted thus far, there remain only the regular appropriation bills and a score of genuinely legislative acts, chiefly in the nature of minor amendments to the legal code. Of the fourteen appropriation measures, only the naval bill and the fortifications bill show any great increase over the general rise of recent years. The fortifications bill about doubles the twenty-five million dollar appropriation of 1916; and the naval bill shows a less proportionate but larger aggregate gain. The necessity of making all the appropriation bills serve as an opportunity for the discussion of unrelated matters, and the tendency to drag out argument over the smaller items while the larger ones were overlooked, resulted in even more protracted consideration than is usually given these bills. With the completion of several measures holding over from the first session—the immigration, vocational education and Porto Rican bills—they constitute almost the only achievements of more than local significance. In its final session the Sixty-fourth Congress took up only what was forced upon it, and no great part of that.

In the few days remaining to the session after this is written, it is possible that the meagre list will be added to: the passage of the espionage bill in the House, of a modified Rivers and Harbors bill in the Senate, of some sort of railway legislation, long pending, in both houses. The Corrupt Practices bill and the ratification of the Colombian treaty seem blocked—as, more agreeably, do the Public Buildings bill and the anti-conservation measures. Failure of administration measures will be explained by Democratic congressmen as due to the Republican filibuster of the final week. They will forget that the whole session has been one chronic filibuster to which they themselves have contributed liberally.

C. M.

Addendum on Suffrage in England

[NOTE: Since the publication of Women and Votes in England by H. N. Brailsford, we have received an addendum from Mr. Brailsford containing the following facts: The London Times has very quietly but none the less decidedly declared for women's suffrage; it is not certain that the anti-suffragists and the lukewarm suffragists together form a majority of the House; Lord Milner is hostile to suffrage; and while the favorite compromise among the public at large is that though men are enfranchised at 21, women shall vote only after 25, the politicians are likely to choose 30 or 35 as the age for women, and to adopt the less generous local government register instead of the more democratic parliamentary register. This compromise will certainly rally an adequate, perhaps an overwhelming majority.—THE EDITORS.]

Correspondence

[NOTE: Pressure on our space forces the omission of correspondence this week. We thank our many correspondents for their varied and valuable letters, and in our next issue we shall print as full a representation as possible.—THE EDITORS.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Letter to the Kaiser

[NOTE: We publish the following letter exactly as it came to us. As far as we know it is genuine and authentic.—THE EDITORS.]

DEAR KAISER:

I thought I'd take my pen in hand to let you know that we are all well and doing considerable thinking and hope you are the same.

I have never seen a palace, nor the Rhine, except in pictures, but perhaps you have not seen a picture of the Des Plaines river and our little village on its banks. It is a quiet, unpretentious place, without a tower or lookout in it, unless you would count house chimneys and church spires as such, and the Des Plaines is bordered by corn fields instead of castles. We haven't any kings here and only a social queen or two, but we all are monarchs of our homes, with the latest phonograph records in the parlor and an automobile of some kind or other in the barn. We have no royal coffers but our bins are filled with coal and our pantries stocked with food. We have no great affairs of state, but we manage to get along with simple pleasures. In summer we motor through such ordinary scenery as we have, and in winter go in to Chicago to see New York's newest comedy success. And all the year round, we listen to the tinkle of the church bells on Sunday; hang up our washings on Monday; go see our little Willies in the school entertainment on Tuesday; eat a church supper on Wednesday; give a luncheon on Thursday; send a glass of jelly to the poor on Friday, give a party to ourselves on Saturday, and listen to the church bells tinkle again on Sunday.

In short, Kaiser, you'll see for yourself that we're comfortable, just real comfortable. Now what I wanted to ask you about is this: when we were so comfortable, all set and snug, why did you raise such a rumpus that you disturb us, even us, all this distance away, peaceful, contented village on the Des Plaines.

War! War! Wh-why should it touch us? We haven't done a thing, away off here by ourselves. Wh-why, we don't even live in Chicago where they have strikes and foreigners and tenements and germs and things. We came out here, purposely, to leave all those horrid things behind. Wh-why, war is the last thing we ever thought would come to touch us with its awful hand. War! War! And besides, we don't know a thing about it. All I ever knew is what I learned in dull history books at school, and some interesting stories I've heard grandmother tell about the Civil War. I hung grandfather's sword in the boys' room, because it looks kind of nice along with the pennants and things, but I certainly didn't mean to engender any martial spirit. Why, when my lover threatened to go down to Cuba to fight the Spaniards because I was going West for the summer, I nearly cried my eyes out until he promised he wouldn't. So you see how *I* feel about bloodshed and carnage and all that!

And all the women in our village are just like me. We have literary clubs, card clubs, guilds, aid societies and various other little local uplifts, but I don't believe any of them have ever thought much about whether you should have an outlet to the warm waters or not, or that you needed more room to grow in. We haven't bothered about Austria, or Poland, or Britannia on the high seas. Russia has been less known to us than India, because our foreign society sends a missionary to the Hindus, and we get the loveliest letters from her. There are two or three, of course, who have been abroad and forever after have monopolized the conversation at every party telling how exquisite the shops are in Paris. But we really haven't thought very much about any of you. We're far away and we have our own things to think about. So you see, Europe, to the most of us, is a queerly shaped continent on page fifty of our geographies. We know the names of the capitals of the large countries, perhaps, and nearly all of us had hoped to get over some time to see your cathedrals. (But I don't know about it now.) In the meantime our little village has been the center of the United States, to us, and the United States has been our world. And why not? Two oceans have been our enclosing walls and we have been content and happy to live within them and among ourselves. Occasional rumbles from your part of the earth have come to us now and again, but we were never greatly interested. We have been busy piling up gold and bumper crops. "Everyone to his own business," said we. "Let the rest of the world mind its affairs and we'll tend to ours."

Then came that awful August. We were greatly shocked that Christian nations could be so wicked as to go to war, and we turned our own Christian backs on you and sighed righteously. War couldn't come to us, thank God! We'd just go on minding our business and making money, here in our snug, isolated country. For two years we did not take you very seriously. We absolutely refused to think of anything that wasn't pleasant. You know we are a nation of optimists. We only said, "Isn't it dreadful about the European war," just like the mothers of a peaceful neighborhood are scandalized when the boys get into a naughty fracas. "Shocking! Yes, indeed! Oh, shouldn't we be thankful to live in this land of peace? And think of our wonderful prosperity! War is so, *so* frightful, I don't see why they keep on. I don't think it can last much longer."

But months and months have passed and you are still at it, and not only that, but an ominous cloud looms on our own horizon. At first we wouldn't look, then we sat up and rubbed our eyes, and then we got on our feet. And now, for the first time in our history we see the truth: the world is a whole made up of many parts and we are one of those parts, not isolated and individual, but bound indissolubly to the others to make one great unit. Whatever injures one, drags down the others. Whatever good comes to one part, blesses the whole.

Kaiser, I have had a mental revolution, along with millions of others of my countrymen, and perhaps we owe you thanks for stirring our sluggish visions, even though it may come to pass that we shall regretfully be your foe. So I thought that I'd write and tell you about it and let you know there is a new ideal stealing over the world and that even we, of this far village, have glimpsed it. We are no longer short-sighted denizens of the prairies, but awakened citizens of the world. We are now groping to find the path of righteousness that such a high calling entails. As a guaranty that my words are not idle, I offer up my three sons as followers of that path, wherever it leads.

HETTIE B. GOLDRICK.

Riverside, Illinois.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Play

Why should there be one law for men and another for women? I will tell you why.

YEARS ago, many, many years ago, my sister and I were living on our ranch in Arizona. About sundown one afternoon she was called away on business, leaving me alone for the night in our cabin, and unprotected. While I was getting undressed I heard a noise outside the door. Quick as thought I snatched a rifle from the wall and put out the light. A moment later the door gave way, and intruders burst into the room. The rifle missed fire and I was quickly overpowered and disarmed. As soon as one of the marauders had lighted a candle I saw I had to deal with three ruffians, all women, all more or less drunk. From the peculiarly evil expression of their faces I knew what they wanted even before two of the miscreants began to shake dice for ME, their helpless and trembling prey. To the third, who looked as if she had a noble nature when sober, I made my appeal. Save me from those two women, I said, and from yourself, and I will marry you.

At this point you interrupt my story. You question its truth. You don't believe I was ever in Arizona. You know that I have never been further west than Iowa.

I admit this, admit also that even if I had lived in Arizona my story would not be true. And because it not only is not but also could not possibly be true I cannot put myself—no man can put himself—in the place of Ruth Jordan, heroine of The Great Divide, which Henry Miller has revived at the Lyceum Theatre. No man can judge Ruth's conduct after she had saved her honor by marrying Stephen Ghent.

Anybody, however, may describe her conduct. Here is the text, minus the stage directions, of her offer to Stephen:

> Ruth. Save me! Save me! Save me, and I will make it up to you. Don't touch me! Listen! Save me from these others, and from yourself, and I will pay you—with my life.
>
> Ghent. With—your life?
>
> Ruth. With all that I am or can be.
>
> Ghent. What do you mean?—You mean you'll go along with me out of this? Stick to me—on the square?
>
> Ruth. Yes.
>
> Ghent. On the dead square?
>
> Ruth. Yes.

Now Ruth did not stick to her bargain. She went back on her word. She welched. I am willing to concede that it would have been impossible for her to do anything else. Ghent had bought off one of the other two men, a Mexican, with a string of gold nuggets. Ruth could not forget those nuggets. They became for her a deadly poisonous symbol of everything she loathed in her predicament. She slaved and toiled until she had bought them back from the Mexican with her own earnings, and during this period she appears to have mentioned them to Stephen almost as often as he and she were alone. Natural conduct enough, I dare say, yet it makes me sorry for Stephen, who comports himself almost as quietly as that husband in Fielding who bore "to be reminded of his transgressions, as a kind of penance, once or twice a day during the residue of his life."

There is another of her husband's transgressions which Ruth seldom spoke of. "That night," she says to him, looking back to their wedding, "that night, when we rode away from the justice's office at San Jacinto, and the sky began to brighten over the desert—the ice that had gathered here—(*she touches her heart*)—began to melt in spite of me. And when the next night and the next day passed, and the next, and still you spared me and treated me with beautiful rough chivalry, I said to myself, 'He has heard my prayer to him. He knows what a girl's heart is.' As you rode before me down the arroyos, and up over the mesas, through the dazzling sunlight and the majestic silence, it seemed as if you were leading me out of a world of little codes and customs into a great new world.—So it was for those first days.—And then—and then—I woke, and saw you standing in my tent-door in the starlight. I knew before you spoke that we were lost. You hadn't the strength to save us."

Only twice, so far as I know, did Ruth speak of this to her husband. But although she said little, she thought the more. She never appears to have told herself, in all her brooding, that a bargain is a bargain, never appears to have tried to persuade herself that for Stephen, too, there was a good deal to be said.

Ruth's treatment of her husband is not unnatural—you see that in spite of good resolutions I cannot help forming an opinion—but isn't it perhaps rather unimaginatively and monotonously unforgiving? The meaning of Moody's play depends, I admit, upon Stephen's estimate of Ruth, not on yours or mine; but, if I am to receive this meaning into anything more than my mind, I must come a little nearer than Moody gives me the means of coming to accordance with Stephen's estimate of Ruth as a human being. When he tells her that their married life has been no failure, that there has been in it "pure good—pure joy—a fortune of it—for both of us," I have too much to take his word for what he has gained.

All this is what many of us thought ten years ago, when The Great Divide was first performed. I can think of no ten-year old play about which my feeling has altered less. In 1907 it was not eagerly up-to-date, and it is not old-fashioned in 1917. No such English has been heard in any other American play that I know of. The speech Moody has given his men and women—barring one or two bits of rhetoric and one or two of bookishness—is a marvel of variety melted down to simplicity. In this language they can say the most everyday things, they can be picturesquely humorous, they can be imaginative, they easily attain beauty. Moody's words, sounding not like his but like theirs, make us feel the contrast between east and west in the United States, make us feel New England as thin fine hampering scruple, and Arizona as an escape into an out-of-door, far-horizoned future, into liberty under wide skies.

No, The Great Divide has not aged. It is as engrossing to-day as on the day it was first given. It may exasperate you, but it never lets your attention wander. Everything in it counts. There is no surplussage. The complicated feelings it represents are represented with firm and simple lines. And somehow, in spite of my inability to like Ruth as well as Stephen likes her, I do share his faith in the worth of the life they will lead together.

Henry Miller is as excellent as ever in the part of Stephen Ghent—a solid, certain portrait, in which the many fine brush-strokes contribute to the total effect of breadth. Miss Gladys Hanson acts well, though she does not make one believe, as Miss Anglin made one believe, in Ruth Jordan's intellectual force and general ability.

Q. K.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Green Sickness

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, by James Joyce. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $1.50.

THERE is a laconic unreasonableness about the ways of creators. It is quite true that the Irish literary revival was beginning to be recognized at precisely the period of Mr. Joyce's novel, and it is also true that his protagonist is a student in Dublin at the hour of the so-called renaissance, a writer and poet and dreamer of dreams. So perverse is life, however, there is scarcely one glimmer in this landscape of the flame which is supposed to have illuminated Dublin between 1890 and 1900. If Stephen Dedalus, the young man portrayed in this novel, had belonged to the Irish revival, it would be much easier for outsiders to "place" him. The essential fact is, he belonged to a more characteristic group which this novel alone has incarnated. One almost despairs of conveying it to the person who has conventionalized his idea of Ireland and modern Irish literature, yet there is a poignant Irish reality to be found in few existing plays and no pre-existent novel, presented here with extraordinary candor and beauty and power.

It is a pleasant assumption of national mythology that the southern Irish are a bright and witty people, effervescent on the sunny side and pugnacious on the other, but quick to act in any event, and frequently charming and carefree and irresponsible. It may be that the Irish exhibit this surface to outsiders and afford a case of street angel and house devil on a national scale, or it may be that the English landlord has chosen to see the Irishman as funny in the way the Southern gentleman chooses to see the Negro as funny, but, however the assumption got started it has been fortified by generations of story-tellers and has provided a fair number of popular writers with a living. It is only when a person with the invincible honesty of James Joyce comes to write of Dubliners as they are, a person who is said to be mordant largely because he isn't mushy, that the discrepancy between the people and the myth is apparent. When one says Dubliners "as they are," one of course is pronouncing a preference. One is simply insisting that the Irishmen of James Joyce are more nearly like one's own estimate of them than the Irishmen of an amiable fabulist like George Birmingham. But there is the whole of the exquisite "Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" to substantiate the assertion that a proud, cold, critical, suspicious, meticulous human being is infinitely more to be expected among educated Catholic Irishmen than the sort of squireen whom Lever once glorified. If this is a new type in Ireland, come into existence with the recent higher education of Catholics, one can only say that it is now by far the most important type to recognize. Bernard Shaw suggested it in the London Irishman, Larry Doyle, who appeared in "John Bull's Other Island," but the main character of the present novel is much more subtly inflected and individualized than Larry Doyle, and is only said to belong to a type to intimate that his general mode is characteristic.

Mr. Joyce's power is not shown in any special inventiveness. A reader of novels will see at once that he has never even thought of "plot" in the ordinary sense, or considered the advantage or importance of consulting the preferences of his reader. The thing he writes about is the thing he knows best, himself, himself at boarding school and university, and any radical variation on the actual terms of that piercing knowledge he has declined to attempt. He has sought above everything to reveal those circumstances of his life which had poignancy, and the firmest claim on him to being written was not that a thing should be amenable to his intentions as a sophisticated novelist, but that a thing should have complete personal validity. It did not weigh with him at any moment that certain phrases or certain incidents would be intensely repugnant to some readers. Was the phrase interwoven with experience? Was the incident part of the fabric of life? He asked this searchingly, and asked no more. It is not even likely that he made inquiry why, out of all that he could write, he selected particularly to reveal details that seldom find expression. Had he made the inquiry he might well have answered that the mere consciousness of silence is an incitement to expression, that expression is the only vengeance a mortal can take on the restrictions to which he finds himself subject. If others submit to those restrictions it is their own affair. To have the truth one must have a man's revelation of that which was really significant to himself.

Considering that this portrait is concluded before its subject leaves college one may gather that the really significant relations are familiar and religious, and that the adjustment is between a critical spirit and its environment. What gives its intensity to the portrait is the art Mr. Joyce has mastered of communicating the incidents of Stephen's career through the emotions they excited in him. We do not perceive Stephen's father and mother by description. We get them by the ebb and flood of Stephen's feeling, and while there are many passages of singularly lifelike conversation—such, for example, as the wrangle about Parnell that ruined the Christmas dinner or the stale banter that enunciated the father's return to Cork—the viridity is in Stephen's soul. "Stephen watched the three glasses being raised from the counter as his father and his two cronies drank to the memory of their past. An abyss of fortune or of temperament sundered him from them. His mind seemed older than theirs: it shone coldly on their strifes and happiness and regrets like a moon upon a younger earth. No life or youth stirred in him as it had stirred in them. He had known neither the pleasures of companionship with others nor the vigor of rude male health nor filial piety. Nothing stirred within his soul but a cold and cruel and loveless lust. His childhood was dead or lost and with it his soul capable of simple joys and he was drifting amid life like the barren shell of the moon."

It is his mortal sin of masturbation that preys most terribly on this youth, and he suffers all the blasting isolation which is created by the sense of sin in connection with it. Eventually he makes a "retreat"—he is being educated by the Jesuits—and goes to confession and for a time knows religious happiness. The explicitness of this experience is more telling than the veiled account of sexual stupidity in Samuel Butler's "Way of All Flesh," and Mr. Joyce is more successful than Samuel Butler in making religious belief seem real. The efforts of a Jesuit father to suggest a religious vocation to Stephen are the beginning of the end of his religion. In "lucid, supple, periodic prose" Mr. Joyce describes the transition from devotional life and a private specializing in mortification to the acceptance of nature and the earth. "His soul had arisen from the grave of boyhood, spurning her grave-clothes. Yes! Yes! Yes! He would create proudly out of the freedom and power of his soul, as the great artificer whose name he bore, a living thing, new and soaring and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beautiful, impalpable, imperishable." The "Yes! Yes! Yes!" gives that touch of intense youthfulness which haunts the entire book, even though Mr. Joyce can be so superb in flaunting Aristotle and Aquinas.

The last chapter of the portrait gives one the *esprit* of the Catholic nationalist students in University College. It is a marvelous version of scurrilous, supercilious, callow youth. Mr. Joyce's subject is not in sympathy with the buzzing internationalist any more than with the arcane Irishman whom he compares to Ireland, "a batlike soul waking to the consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness." Stephen walks by himself, disdainful and bitter, in love and not in love, a poet at dawn and a sneerer at sunset, cold exile of "this stinking dunghill of a world."

A novel in which a sensitive, critical young man is completely expressed as he is can scarcely be expected to be pleasant. "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" is not entirely pleasant. But it has such beauty, such love of beauty, such intensity of feeling, such pathos, such candor, it goes beyond anything in English that reveals the inevitable malaise of serious youth. Mr. Joyce has a peculiar narrative method, and he would have made things clearer if he had adopted H. C. Wells's scheme of giving a paragraphed section to each episode. As the book is now arranged, it requires some imagination on the part of the reader. The Catholic "retreat" also demands attentiveness, it is reported with such acrimonious zeal. But no one who has any conception of the Russian-like frustrations and pessimisms of the thin-skinned and fine-grained Irishman, from early boarding school onward, can miss the tenacious fidelity of James Joyce. He has made a rare effort to transcend every literary convention as to his race and creed, and he has had high success. Many people will furiously resent his candor, whether about religion or nationalism or sex. But candor is a nobility in this instance. F. H.

TIFFANY & CO.

PEARL NECKLACES

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

The Toy Theatre

A Book About the Theatre, by Brander Matthews. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

IT is unhappy work criticizing a book which at first reading opens, as if of its own accord, to a page that sets free the suppressed, happiest memories of boyhood. Brander Matthews in A Book About the Theatre has given me such cause for gratitude. Among a score of unrelated, rather gossipy chapters on the curiosities and by-ways of the theatre, he has written one on the old Toy Theatre of Skelt and Webb that delighted stage-struck mid-Victorian children. How many boys of the time, grown up and become men of letters, speak of it with wistful reminiscence! Thackeray sees to it that young Georgie Osborne knows Skelt; Dickens in his Christmas Stories celebrates him, and best of all, Master Robert Louis the eternal boy immortalizes him and his works in Penny Plain and Two-pence Colored.

It is only by accident that Professor Matthews can give me too the thrill which he recalls to his contemporaries. I imagine that to most young Americans who date from the 'nineties the Toy Theatre means nothing. But that is in part reason for my gratitude. I possessed one that Master Robert Louis himself might have played with, a twice hand-me-down, incredibly antique artistically; and I too cut out and colored characters and scenes, devised with a candle and painted glass effects that anticipated Mr. Belasco, and acted out before bored young friends melodramatic scenes wherein the effect was always marred by the fact that at critical moments the leading threads of the characters would always break, leaving them stuck hopelessly in the misfit grooves. I even possessed the very play that Stevenson and Professor Matthews celebrate, that impossible bandit spectacle, The Miller and His Men. I lived in that toy theatre even after I was old enough to know better; I graduated from it sorrowfully.

Anything I may say of Professor Matthews's book, therefore, must be taken with the salt of gratitude. And much of the remainder is quite as fascinating to anyone who loves more than the mere commonplaces of the theatre. The book does not pretend to be anything more than excursions into the back country of the drama, the ramblings of a man who perhaps has said everything he has to say on the true theatre. There are chapters on the opera libretto, the dance, the acrobat and the negro minstrel, the pantomime, scene-painting, the magician, the puppet-play —though the most artistic example, the serious puppet dramas given in the Open-air Park in Munich, is not mentioned—the famous shadow-plays of Caran D'Ache, and our old friend Punch and Judy. They are all very amusing, well documented, and full of scholarly gossip.

Even in these and similar subjects, however, the life-long critic will out, dropping as if unconsciously viewpoints, prejudices, habits of mind about the theatre which deserve — and need — to be taken more seriously Professor Matthews's constant, however unintentional, attitude is that of a man who looks backward, who recognizes happily in the present only those things which are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEND IN YOUR NAME

Help demonstrate that the President will have

The United Support of the American People

in taking prompt and effective action to

UPHOLD AMERICAN RIGHTS AND DEFEND THE NATIONAL HONOR

Many citizens who are intensely convinced that the present state of the German submarine question demands prompt and vigorous action in defense of American rights hesitate to press their views for fear of embarrassing the President. No such consideration stays the hand of those who seek to paralyze any effort he may make to carry into practical effect his pledge to omit no act necessary for the protection of American ships and American citizens engaged upon lawful errands on the high seas. The clamor of extreme pacifists, and of those who from other motives are opposed to this patriotic course, makes itself insistently heard, within Congress and without. It is no longer permissible, therefore, for those to remain silent who wish to support the President in the protection of our national rights and the defense of our national honor.

Our ships and our flag are being excluded from the seas by the threat of death and destruction conveyed in Germany's declaration of war on neutral shipping. The need of the hour is to take effectual measures to safeguard our shipping and our citizens, rather than to wait for Americans to be murdered and then go to war to punish the offender. To refuse, or too long delay, such protection would be to acquiesce in the subjugation of American rights to German domination. The time has come to assure the President that he will have the overwhelming support of his fellow countrymen in taking effective measures to meet the intolerable situation with which the country is now confronted.

All those who desire to join in expressing these views are requested to send their names to Nathan A. Smyth, Secretary,
80 Broadway, New York City.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE
ALTON B. PARKER
JOHN B. STANCHFIELD
JAMES BYRNE
J. ALDEN WEIR
MARTIN W. LITTLETON
JOSEPH M. PRICE
HENRY DE FOREST BALDWIN
ARNOLD W. BRUNNER
R. UNDERWOOD JOHNSON
FABIAN FRANKLIN
W. J. CURTIS
WALTER W. PRICE
EDWARD DELAVAN PERRY
J. R. WHEELER
A. PERRY OSBORN
OTTO T. BANNARD

WILLIAM H. TAFT
ELIHU ROOT
HENRY L. STIMSON
JAMES R. GARFIELD
FREDERICK C. TANNER
CASS GILBERT
MUNROE SMITH
PHILIP J. McCOOK
GEORGE A. DIXON
ROBT. S. BREWSTER
GEORGE H. RICHARDS
CHARLES B. DE CAMP
HENRY H. CURRAN
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
BERTRAM G. GOODHUE
ROBERT R. REED
WM. N. COHEN

GEORGE S. HORNBLOWER
THATCHER M. BROWN
ALBERT B. KERR
ALEXANDER M. WHITE
JULIUS SACHS
WM. JAY SCHIEFFELIN
A. H. THORNDIKE
LEWIS A. STIMSON
FRANK E. DODD
GRAHAM SUMNER
CHAS. F. NEERGAARD
JOHN W. AGAR
BENJAMIN M. DAY
ALFRED JARETSKI
GEO. F. CRANE
HERBERT GUTTERSON
EVERETT P. WHEELER

The names sent in will be communicated to the President. Responses are already pouring in. To extend this advertising send your check to the Secretary.

Make the Demonstration More Impressive by Sending in Your Name

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not too strange to one habituated to looking at the past. The future, one imagines, he distrusts, seeing already at work tendencies which puzzle and shock him. He does not live so altogether in the past as William Winter, nor is he so resolute in his hatreds. Yet in an influential teacher of drama even so much of an inability to look forward makes one pause; 'Tis enough, 'twill serve. The old familiar names, Scribe, Dumas Fils, Charles Reade, Sardou and the great Sarcey are scattered thickly through the book, and Sir Arthur Wing Pinero, apparently, is the last of the prophets.

When a critic seriously traces the links by which Buffalo Bill's Wild West and Oedipus Tyrannus are seen to be only the extremes of the same, long, unified chain, one begins to wonder. It is all primarily part of the Show Business, and the economic analogy that "the inferior always tends to drive out the superior" is taken regretfully but without much hope. Perhaps the very fact that Professor Matthews can write so lovingly of negro minstrelsy and shadow pictures, of Scribe and Sardou, shows that his habit is to prefer what the French call the "machine." What is worse, he usually prefers the outworn machine, the old model.

A few examples will serve to show that Professor Matthews is forever marking out limits and saying: Thus far and no farther! His feeling about the interpretation of poetry and drama through the dance is that "the Muse of Dancing has no right to annex the territory of her sisters." And so with the other arts. One feels that he keeps the Laokoon and the works of Irving Babbitt by his bedside. He will discuss scene setting and decoration as far as Belasco and Winthrop Ames, but at Gordon Craig he balks and over Max Reinhardt he casts out his shoe. Discussing the dance he speaks affectionately of Fanny Ellsler, Genée, the Black Crook, Loie Fuller and the Hippodrome ballet, and leaves Isadora Duncan and the Russian Ballet beyond the pale of art. In pantomime he stops at L'Enfant Prodigue and dismisses Sumurun from serious attention. Vaudeville he sees only as a feeder to the legitimate.

Worst of all, he never takes the opportunity, though it is there abundantly, to recognize and discuss—let alone praise!—the works of young America, of those men who are hopeful and intelligent innovators in all branches of the theatre; the men who dare produce Dunsany, and who experiment with the "new" technique to which the Movies have given a second birth, or who are adapting to the American theatre the ideas of the European idol-breakers in light and costume and setting. Apparently they do not exist for Professor Matthews, any more than George Cohan does. In a volume devoted to Punch and Judy one might even expect some mention of the Movies, if only as a sacrilege, but all Professor Matthews does is to mis-call them in terms already obsolete and pedantic. "The cinematograph or bioscope, or whatever it may be called" is his comment on the possibilities, still hardly grasped, of the screen drama. For Sarcey was a Pharaoh who knew not the Movies and beyond Sarcey our American loses the path.

There are a few chapters of "regular" criticism, on the five-act tradition, on dramatizing novels, on collaboration, but they offer nothing new. Sardou still rules the roost. Our women dramatists are ruled out of court because (1) they have never yet written a great drama, and (2) Herbert Spencer says they lack the scientific imagination that goes to play building. The possibilities which will emerge as woman frees herself from the dwarfing conditions which the old-fashioned drama he loves reflects so iron-

People who offer bargains get rich quicker than those who take advantage of them.

Mark Cross

New York
404 Fifth Avenue
(at 37th Street)
253 Broadway

Boston
145 Tremont Street

London
89 Regent Street

The World's Greatest Leather Stores

IN THE WILDERNESS

By ROBERT HICHENS

Author of "The GARDEN of ALLAH," etc.

"Cannot be read without profound emotion . . . Every reader to whom 'The Garden of Allah' was an adventure in true enjoyment will read this book with an equal or a greater pleasure."
—*N. Y. Times.*

"A really remarkable book—in fact, Hichens' masterpiece."—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

Cloth, 12mo, net $1.50

LYDIA of the PINES

By HONORÉ WILLSIE

Author of "STILL JIM" and "The Heart of the Desert."

"A noble and very moving story of a high-souled, but most human girl . . . Mrs. Willsie is growing in strength, more surely becoming one of the authentic voices of the nobler Americanism.
—*Richard Le Gallienne.*

Cloth, 12mo, net $1.40

Publishers FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY

Every Home Owner and Builder should consider

Ask for Booklet P-17. It shows how to plan your bathroom and arrange your fixtures.

The Trenton Potteries Company

"Bathrooms of Character"

To the uninitiated, plumbing fixtures all look alike—the difference is one of years. Almost any fixture is good for a year or two—but after that you will conclude that the best is none too good.

All fixtures are white. The surface glazed? Yes. *But,* The Trenton Potteries Company China Fixtures have the enamel baked on a clay body—very different from what you may get on a cheaper fixture (very little cheaper). Clay products differ. A manufacturer who skimps the baking has a glaze that is soft. We *guarantee* our ware is subjected to heat of not less than 2400 degrees—often more. It means the hardest possible *surface* and the hardest possible ware *beneath* the surface. It means years of service after poorer made plumbing fixtures are defaced and hammered beyond recognition.

It's TRUE HOME INSURANCE to secure The Trenton Potteries All-Clay Plumbing Fixtures. Tell any plumber you want them and look for the trade-mark stamped under the glaze.

THE TRENTON POTTERIES COMPANY
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY, U. S. A.
World's Largest Makers of Fine Plumbing Fixtures

Mrs. Mabel Dodge

is prepared to assist in the furnishing and decorating of rooms, to supply ideas of her own, or to express those of her clients.

CONSULTATION BY APPOINTMENT —
23 FIFTH AVENUE

ically, these do not interest or impress Professor Matthews. As it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be, seems to be the burden of his lay.

In the best chapter, which concludes the book, there is an earnest plea for genuine dramatic critics as well as play-reviewers, men who can write criticism that is really creation. Professor Matthews recognizes the presence among us of many writers who are well equipped for the task, and he demands more. We need them, as we have needed Professor Matthews, but they must look less to the past and more to the strange and pregnant present. They must above all look to the future. And they must be flexible minded, which our scholar is not; they must not mark out the bounds too rigidly. Professor Matthews blames Stevenson's lack of success as a dramatist —an opinion which G. B. S. does not altogether share — to the fact that he could never get away from the Toy Theatre. One feels in this book that the author has himself never quite got away from the greater Toy Theatre. He tells us approvingly how it was worked in the past and he is disconcerted to see that to-day's children are not satisfied with even "two-pence colored." For the modern theatre, one hopes, is no longer a toy.

R. E. R.

Citing Spencer for a Purpose

Man Versus the State, by Herbert Spencer. Edited by Truxton Beale. New York: Mitchell Kennerley. $2.00.

THE underlying conception of this edition was an entirely admirable one; its execution has come very near to tragedy. Nothing would have been more useful than an edition of Mr. Spencer's essays which should have related them to the theory and the needs of the modern American state. Such a work, taking into account the results of a generation of important changes in the perspective of criticism, and of little less than a revolution in the results of the practical functioning, would have thrown a flood of light on certain fundamental political problems. But it is a very different volume Mr. Beale has given us. Gathering about him in massed formation the heavy artillery of American conservatism—Mr. Root, Dr. Butler, Judge Gary, Mr. Taft—he has prefaced Spencer's essays by a series of prose lyrics which, while they may gratify the few remaining adherents of the Spencerian philosophy, are otherwise valuable only as a somewhat inept expression of the ideals of the last age. Few of Mr. Beale's contributors seem alive either to Spencer's chronological significance, or to the fact that the fundamental tenet of his thinking was the movement of society, and hence the necessity of adapting its processes to social change. The uncritical lugubriousness of their remarks is for the most part no more than arid repetition of what is better said in the body of the work. The philosophic attitude they express reads like a commentary upon Darwinism by a saddened believer in special creation. Their essays are interesting as a contribution to the understanding of much modern discontent with politics. But it is a melancholy and disturbing spectacle that men from whom a leadership in ideas was legitimately to be expected should be capable of no more than this uncritical and unrealistic dogmatism.

The truth is that the starting-point of their attitude to Mr. Spencer dates from the time when it seemed likely to his contemporaries that the gospel of social progress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ENDORSEMENT OF BIRTH CONTROL

AN EXPRESSION OF INDIVIDUAL OPINION FROM A NUMBER OF DISTINGUISHED MEN AND WOMEN

We desire to help in supporting a body of public opinion, which will lead to so amending the Federal and State laws, that it will not be a criminal offence to give out information on the subject of Birth Control, and that such information will not be classed with obscenity and indecency.

We maintain that it is no more indecent to discuss the anatomy, physiology, and hygiene of reproduction, in a scientific spirit, than it is to discuss the functions of the brain, the heart or the lungs.

We believe that the question as to whether or not, and when, a woman should have a child, is not a question for physicians to decide,—except when the woman's life is endangered,—or for the clergy, or the state legislators to decide, but a question for the individual family concerned to decide.

The United States is now the only progressive country where it is a criminal offence to give directions relating to the prevention of conception.

We call attention to the fact that anyone can write to the Agricultural Department in Washington, for any kind of information desired, in regard to plant life and animal life. We submit that the knowledge of the procreation and care of human life, is of even greater importance.

We believe that the restrictive laws on Birth Control now in existence, lead to the illegal dissemination of incomplete and harmful information, which causes great misery and suffering. We maintain that knowledge imparted by persons properly qualified to give it, would be an inestimable boon to the individual, to the family and to the state, and would lead to the physical and spiritual improvement of the human race.

The two objections most commonly made against this movement are: First, that "the discussion and regulation of this matter would be contrary to the will of God and the laws of Nature," and secondly, that "to allow free distribution of information in regard to Birth Control would lead to greater immorality."

We believe that the first objection does not bear analysis. It is unreasonable to assume that the world is better, because of children born through accidental and irresponsible procreation, resulting inevitably in the birth of many thousands who are diseased, deformed, or defective, than it would be if fewer children, and healthier ones, were born into homes ready to welcome them, and properly prepared and able to care for them. The whole history of civilization is based on the subordination of natural laws and forces to human reason and intelligence. By guiding, regulating and intelligently directing Nature, we have produced more beautiful fruits and flowers, finer and stronger animals, why not better, stronger, healthier and happier human beings?

In answer to the second objection, we wish to say, that we believe it fails to take into account, how much greater would be the certain good accomplished, than the possible harm that might result. The increase of immorality among the few who are now restrained by fear, would be overwhelmingly offset, by: (1)—the removal of the temptation to criminal abortion; (2)—the decrease in the birth of the unfit, (from which class our prisons, reformatories and insane asylums are largely filled); (3)—the reduction of illegitimacy; (4)—the preservation of women from too frequent pregnancy, (which leads to a shattered nervous and physical condition both in mother and child); (5)—the economic relief to the families of the poor, (who only too often have not money or food enough, properly to nourish the many children who are born to them); and (6)—the encouragement to earlier marriages, (which would tend to reduce the evils of prostitution).

We believe that the abuse of knowledge is less to be feared than the abuse of misinformation and ignorance, and that scientific, reliable information, on the subject of Birth Control, would lead to a greater and swifter development towards human freedom, health and happiness.

DR. L. EMMETT HOLT
DR. ABRAM JACOBI
DR. FREDERICK PETERSON
DR. THOMAS W. SALMON
DR. GEORGE S. HUNTINGTON
DR. LUDWIG KAST
DR. AUGUST HOCH
DR. IRA S. WILE
DR. GEORGE M. PARKER
DR. ALEXANDER F. STEVENSON
DR. ALICE HAMILTON
DR. JOHN FAVILL
MRS. J. BORDEN HARRIMAN
MRS. AMOS PINCHOT
MRS. CHARLES TIFFANY
MRS. ROBERT M. LAFOLLETTE
MRS. HERBERT CROLY
MRS. PHILIP LITTELL
MRS. RAYMOND B. STEVENS
MABEL KITTREDGE
MRS. ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS
RABBI WISE
MISS C. RUUTZ-REES
REVEREND PERCY GRANT
REVEREND JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
MRS. SIMEON FORD
MRS. WILLIAM I. THOMAS
MRS. AMY WALKER FIELD
MRS. ROBERT P. BASS
MRS. MARY HEATON VORSE
MR. AND MRS WILL IRWIN
MR. AND MRS. PAUL MANSHIP
ERNEST POOLE
GEORGE F. PORTER
GEORGE RUBLEE
MRS. WILLIAM LEON GRAVES
MRS. JOHN WILLIAMS
MRS. GEORGE B. HOPKINS
PROFESSOR WARNER FITE
PROFESSOR WILLIAM P. MONTAGU
PROFESSOR CHARLES ZUEBLIN
PROFESSOR C. S. W. McCLURE
PROFESSOR JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON
WALTER LIPPMANN
JULIET BARRETT RUBLEE

If you desire to help in spreading this opinion throughout the country, send money at once to the National Birth Control League, 280 Madison Ave., New York City. It will be used for nothing else.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exhibition of
Paintings and Etchings
by Stephen Parrish
until March 9th

Braun Galleries
13 West 46th Street

PAINTINGS BY AMERICAN
IMPRESSIONISTS AND
POST-IMPRESSIONISTS
ALWAYS ON VIEW
DANIEL GALLERY
2 WEST 47TH STREET NEW YORK

CAMP PENN, ELEVENTH SEASON
Valcour Island, Lake Champlain
A Camp for Boys that is "Different"

Camp Penn is "DIFFERENT" because of its exceptionally high standard of character, because of the individual oversight and small group system, because it is a REAL camp and not a school in disguise, and particularly because the whole system is designed especially to develop self-reliance, initiative self-help, real camp-craft, a true appreciation of the "Great Outdoors," as well as to give each boy a bully good time!

We would be pleased to send you our booklet

Charles K. Taylor, M. A., Director, Chestnut Hill, Phila., Pa.

LE PAGE'S GLUE HANDY TUBES
MEND IT TODAY 10¢

McClurg's Book Service

The books reviewed and advertised in this magazine can be procured from us without delay. We quote the customary discounts to Public Libraries and Colleges. Correspondence solicited from librarians unacquainted with our enormous book stock and facilities for handling library orders.

LIBRARY DEPARTMENT

A. C. McCLURG & CO., CHICAGO
Wholesale and Retail Booksellers

had at last been preached. It was an astounding spectacle to watch the mental gymnastics Mr. Spencer could perform with natural rights and a little physiological metaphor. As a fact, the clean antitheses which seem to make his work so logical are rarely related to the life we know. Mr. Barker has wisely insisted that no understanding of Mr. Spencer is complete which fails to take account of his Nonconformist origins. Few religious attitudes are so intensely personal in character. Few religious organizations, at any rate in the modern home, have suffered so severely from the persecutions of government. The nonconformists asked only to be left alone; and they had that intimate faith in their certain salvation which made success an indubitable thing. Mr. Spencer began to write at a time when the laissez-faire which is so intimately connected with this feeling began to triumph in political and economic life. He sympathized heartily with the current dogma that competition was *eo nomine* beneficient. He urged almost with passion that the function of government is the merely negative one of adequately keeping the ring. Upon these arid theories the hypothesis of natural selection seemed at first to set the seal of scientific rectitude. They sufficed with most thinkers until the last quarter of the nineteenth century. But when the workers secured their enfranchisement, and the English State began to assume an uncomfortably positive character it became obvious that the direction of life might be different from what Mr. Spencer had prophesied. The "stern discipline of nature" of which he made so much began to undergo a human amelioration. Mr. Spencer failed to see that this amelioration might well effect the social indignation for which he professed himself so anxious. State control seemed to him simply arbitrary control; and in his autobiography he has told us that he inherited a family antagonism to all such authority. He thus failed to understand completely the personality of institutions. Government meant to him—as it seems to mean for Mr. Bryan—simply a machine for the manufacture of red tape. Not content with emphasizing the obvious fact that its value will depend upon the ability of its agents, he argued that we must expect more from the individual citizen who gives his best to himself, than from the official who—after all—is giving his best to others. He had no high esteem for the motives of generous conduct.

The only thing for which Mr. Spencer really seems to care is the full expression of individual will. But no one can read his work with any attention without the impression that his individual is a poor exile from men, who reads Social States with unction in the lonely evenings on Juan Fernandez Island. Nor did he hesitate to rely upon innate sentiments of justice and beneficence—of which he was convinced by the study of phrenology—in order to preserve the equilibrium of the state from the descriptiveness of his anarchism. He did not hesitate to argue that it is characteristic of human consciousness so spontaneously to adjust itself—when untramelled by state interference—to the will of others as to make possible a progressive social harmony. So that government to him was no more than a relic of militarism, ideally unmoral and necessarily destructive of spontaneity. If the citizen chose to ignore it he had a natural right to do so; the right to dissent in religious matters must be universalized. The less government we have, the more shall we approach to freedom. And when all this is expressed with a fine air of scientific modernity, and a thoroughgoing respect for that individualism which lies at the basis of English life, it is not difficult to understand the reason of its popularity. It apotheosizes the philosophy of the man in the street.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DO THE PEOPLE WANT WAR?

In the second week of February the American Union Against Militarism sent out 100,000 return postal cards, asking people whether they wanted to go to war to enforce our rights of commerce in the war-zone declared by Germany. These cards went to all kinds of people in city and country, from two registration lists supplied by Congressmen themselves. The recipients were asked to mail their answers to their Congressmen. We are informed that the result, based on returns to thirty Congressmen from widely scattered parts of the country, was a heavy vote for peace. The average was six to one against war. The lowest vote against war in any district was four to one, the highest eleven to one. *The people do not want this country to go to war.*

Who *does* want the country to go to war?

The following quotation from the weekly letter of a Baltimore firm, a member of the New York Stock Exchange, may shed some light on the question:

> *"Regarding war as inevitable, Wall Street believes that it would be preferable to this uncertainty about the actual date of its commencement. Canada and Japan are at war and are more prosperous than ever before. . . . The popular view is that stocks would have a quick, sharp reaction immediately upon outbreak of hostilities and that then they would enjoy an old-fashioned bull market such as followed the outbreak of war with Spain in 1898. . . .*
>
> *"The advent of peace would force a readjustment of commodity prices and would probably mean a postponement of new enterprises. As peace negotiations would be long drawn out, the period of waiting and uncertainty for business would be long. If the United States does not go to war it is nevertheless good opinion that the preparedness program will compensate in good measure for the loss of the stimulus of actual war."*

In other words, Wall Street's first choice is war, and its second, a great preparedness program. In the last two and a half years, Wall Street has sold two and a half thousand million dollars worth of war supplies to the Allies. But the Allies are now, to a large extent, making their own supplies, and Wall Street must find a new market. War with Germany would be the surest means of selling these products to the United States government. War is, indeed, "preferable," but a great preparedness campaign is the next best bet. They must sell here what they can no longer sell over there. Someone must take up the White Man's Burden.

Wall Street charges that the "peace campaign" in the United States, being a hint to Germany that we do not want to fight, is an invitation to her to sink our ships. The opposite is true. Germany has no fear of our military participation in the war. Germany realizes, as do the statesmen of the Allies themselves, that, for the present, our entrance into the war would not materially aid the Entente. But Germany does fear three things when she considers the possibility of war with us: (1) Losing the influence of a great, unembittered neutral nation in the peace negotiations; (2) losing the friendship of the only rich power that can help her, financially and industrially, in the reconstruction period, to which she already looks forward with dread; and (3) losing the friendship of millions of German-Americans who, though loyal to the United States, have a legitimate affection for the nation of their birth, which would be largely destroyed by war between the two countries. In short, the more real our friendship appears to Germany at this time, the more unwilling will she be to forfeit it through ruthless submarine aggressions.

The forces in the United States that represent money power, and the great newspapers which these forces control, are urging the country to war in the name of national honor. We say there is no defense of national honor in going to war with a nation that is down, even if that nation, in its frantic efforts to get up, has committed aggressions that are barbarous and unwarranted, though not primarily directed against us. Germany's armies are outnumbered and surrounded by a ring of steel, her warships and transports cannot sail in any one of the seven seas. Submarines cannot carry troops. If today there was no one on the American continent except children with toy bows and arrows, it is doubtful whether Germany could land a single regiment on our soil. Does any grown man seriously maintain that going to war with Germany under such circumstances will vindicate the honor of the United States?

Wall Street is loud in its denunciation of a popular referendum before war is declared.

And yet, if there is any one thing in the world that the people themselves have a right to decide, it is whether there shall be peace or war. Congress has the constitutional power to declare war, but if war comes it will not be Congress that will do the fighting. The editors will not do the fighting; nor will our bellicose lawyers, bankers, stock brokers and other prominent citizens, who mess at Delmonico's, bivouac in club windows, and are at all times willing to give to their country's service the last full measure of conversation. No, the people themselves will do the fighting, and they will pay the bill. In death, in suffering, in sorrow, and in taxes to the third and fourth generations, the people who fight will pay. And therefore, we say that the people themselves should speak before Congress is permitted to declare war.

Abraham Lincoln said, "I am for the people,—the people of the whole nation—doing just as they please in all matters which concern the whole nation." We say with Lincoln that "The people are the rightful masters of both Congresses and Courts." We say with James Bryce that "A state . . . is no wiser, no more righteous than the human beings of which it consists."

The people may be against war, or they may be for it, but whether they are for or against it, they have a right to decide, and no man and no condition of the world's affairs can take that right from them.

If you want to spread this point of view widely over the country, send money at once to COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRATIC CONTROL (formerly Emergency Office), Room 1034, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

AMOS PINCHOT
RANDOLPH S. BOURNE
MAX EASTMAN
WINTHROP D. LANE
Committee for Democratic Control

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has about it that facile air of obvious commonsense which has been the grave of half a hundred speculative systems. But a philosophy must be tested by its fruits; and a philosophy which required the continuous attention of government to its pathetic inadequacies invites its own supersession by that very government it so heartily condemns.

The collectivism of modern life, in fact, is no more than a natural result of the excessive individualism Mr. Spencer beatified. Where he was profoundly right was in his emphasis upon the value of originality and in his insistence on the inherent dangers of officialism. But he did not know enough history to set his criticisms in an adequate perspective. His commentators in this volume, however, seem in general even less well informed than Mr. Spencer himself. So that what they have in general done is to paint a gloomy picture of approaching servitude consequent upon the failure of this age to read Mr. Spencer's work. They condemn the idea of governmental regulation as the uncritical panacea of our time; they entirely fail to perceive, however, that their condemnation is itself erected with a substitutive panacea. We are given a bewildering series of generalizations, none of which seems even remotely related to the conditions of our time. What, for example, does Mr. Root mean by the assertion that the United States is passing from a régime of contract to a régime of status? Where is the evidence for the existence of certain absolute political principles against which modern legislation is so dangerously transgressing? Are we to take Senator Lodge (who is not usually guilty of humor) seriously when he argues that governmental regulation will destroy the government which Washington founded? Is there really any more reason for retaining Washington's methods of government than for retaining his method of shaving? What precisely does Judge Gary mean when he begs us not to "limit opportunity by limiting power"? Is he not confounding the presidency of the steel corporation with the presidency of the United States? Mr. Augustus Gardner—whose comment is an incredible tissue of nonsense—derives from Spencer the illuminating dictum that government is bad because socialist communities have failed. Dr. Butler—who knows better—talks largely of the "moral inviolability" of personality. How does he propose to deal with the "moral violation" of the personalities of Colorado miners which investigation so recently revealed? Or would such action "violate morally" the personality of Mr. Rockefeller? Dean Harlan Stone is anxious that legislation should be properly drafted; and he makes the refreshing discovery that legislation should be wisely conceived in principle. Mr. Taft sapiently remarks that "laws which are adapted to an ideal people moved only by the highest moral considerations and governed by every proper self-restraint, are ill adapted to people as we know them"; but he entirely fails to perceive that this is the case for governmental regulation. I have been able, with difficulty, to refrain from quoting from Mr. David Jayne Hill and Mr. Truxton Beale. Each seems equally ignorant of the progress in political theory during the last thirty years.

The tragedy of this book lies in the fact that there is really no reason to hope for a better production some thirty years from now. The political science which the present generation is imbibing has most of the fallacies and fewer of the virtues than the old. As an abstract science, a rare genius like Henry Sedgwick can sometimes make it the vehicle of a superb ethical influence. But the world is too rarely given the possession of such men. It is high time that our universities understood the relation of political theory to history and economics on the one hand, and to psychology and ethics on the other. Government is not a mere matter of description. You cannot learn the problems of democracy from a lecturer or his systems. One day those who have charge of this golden opportunity will realize that a great speculative historian of the nineteenth century has left priceless warning about this vicious abstractness. The words of Frederic Maitland carry with them the connotation of truth. Books like this may cease to be written when our teachers give heed to what he has said.

H. J. L.

The Thoroughbred, by H. K. Webster. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. $1.35.

CELIA is the thoroughbred. When she marries the modest self-made engineer, Alfred Blair, and Alfred loses his fortune, every penny of it, she does not hesitate to go with him to a twelve-dollar-a-month flat and live on the new income of twenty-two a week. It is part of her bargain; if it means giving up the dresses, the automobile, the maid, the social prestige, she will not let Alfred believe that all she wanted of him was his bank account. She would be true to the newer noblesse oblige of the Chicago financial aristocracy. But in poverty (for so such an income is here defined) she of course discovers love and reality and happiness. Her wish for a baby is happily timed to coincide with Alfred's new success, so that they can return to the normal level after a romantic life in cheap apartments and home cooking and the delights of the ten-cent movies. This trivial prettifaction of the commonplace follows an old formula. Americans still cling to the myth that the one inalienable right of a citizen is the sort of success that puts him in the interest supported class. Just because the hard facts of the new industrialism make such a success the luckiest of strokes for one out of ten thousand we want our novelists to write as if it were the normal career of ninety-nine in a hundred. The novelist who can flatter us in our determined delusion is sure of popular favor. Mr. Webster combines this formula with a style of some distinction and considerable gayety. In The Real Adventure he wrote a novel which was rich in performance. The Thoroughbred is mere time-serving to the gods of publicity and best-sellerdom.

Contributors

to this issue

W. A. Robinson is a professor in the department of political science of Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

C. E. Fryer is associate professor of history at McGill University, Montreal, and received his education in England, at the University of California, and at Harvard.

Charles Merz is the Washington representative of The New Republic.

Leo Stein is a New Yorker who has lived much in France and Italy and has made a life-study of painting.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED